

Editorial

1. The Emerging New World Order

The world has in these two years come through some scathing changes. Those who are opposed to socialism can rejoice in the events of 1989 which saw the downfall of all East European communist governments, leaving China, North Korea and Cuba as the only surviving socialist governments. Ethiopia and Vietnam have also abandoned the socialist path, and have decided to join the market economy system of the world. The breaking of the Berlin Wall, which had little to do with socialism in the first place, has been an occasion for rejoicing for all.

In 1990-91, the Soviet Union has not only taken to the capitalist path with little reservation; the Soviet Union as an entity has almost ceased to exist. The fifteen new republics of Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Russia, Moldavia, Ukraine, Byelorussia, Armenia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kirghizia, Uzbekistan, Azerbaijan, Turkmenistan and Tadzhikistan will enter into various configurations of economic and political confederation. The number of countries in the world will go up from 171 to 185 (the two Germanies having united). A new power grouping could emerge, centring on the Russian Republic, as soon as that nation can put its economy in some working order. And non-Russians fear the power of Russia. Mr. Yeltsin's uncompromising stand for a strong Russian Republic instills fears in other republics. They see the possibility of a semi-fascist Russia oppressing them. Russians themselves see Yeltsin as a counter-weight to Gorbachov, but refuse to place their confidence in either Yeltsin or Gorbachev. Gorbachev seems to be on the way out. Yeltsin may follow soon, and a new leadership, hopefully more democratic than Yeltsin, will emerge. The possibility of another coup cannot be totally ruled out. The West is on guard, fully armed.

Some main features of the new world order are already emerging. The first thing to note is that the oppressed and exploited peoples of the world can no longer count on the Soviet Union as a bulwark against the insolent might of the Western Alliance. They will have to be mainly on their own, dependent on inefficient bodies like NAM or the Group of 77 for the co-ordination and pursuit of their common interests. China will not take the place of the Soviet Union as champion of the oppressed, mainly because of the huge risks involved, but also because the Chinese people have all along history manifested only a limited international orientation. Effective instruments for the Two-third World's struggle for emancipation from economic, cultural and political domination

have yet to be forged to suit the new world order.

Second, the Gulf War has given an occasion for the Western Alliance to flex its muscles, with the U S A in the lead. But that leadership is not entirely uncontested within the Western Alliance itself. Talk about a "Unipolar World" is largely non-sense. Japan has to be reckoned with. Neither France nor Germany nor the still emerging European Community is particularly keen to remain under America's thumb. But the perennial power equation among the three leading states of Europe, namely Germany, U K and France, stand in the way of European anti-Americanism taking any defiant forms.

The USA would like to give the impression that, having demonstrated its technological and military prowess and superiority during the Gulf War, it is now the uncontested leader of the world. Facts speak otherwise. Her own economy is hollow and could cave in any time. The debt burden of the USA is unsufferably high. Stagflation is again a reality in the economy, and a recession seems an imminent threat. Militarily USA may be number one, but in terms of economic health and technological innovation, Japan and Germany seem to be way ahead. If the Gulf War had not been paid for by other nations, the American economy would have already collapsed. There has been temporary success in bolstering up the arms market, but the limits can already be seen. The recent food loan to Russia of 1.5 billion dollars. in return for a pledge of half Russia's gold reserves, gives a temporary boost to the American Economy and the doom of the Russian economy more imminent. But doom awaits all.

A frantic search is on for new markets for commodities, technology and investment; at the moment India and China, or Asia in general, offer more potential stability and opportunity for profit than Eastern Europe or the Soviet Union. That explains why the big IMF loan came through for India without much of a hitch. It should be seen not as a favour to India, but more as a well calculated strategy, until investments in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe become less risky. India will soon have a billion people, while the whole of Europe and the Soviet Union combined would have only about half that number of clients. The eyes of the West as well as of Japan are very much on the Asian markets. But if the Asians are too scared about this, their economies cannot make much progress, unless they devise a new economic system.

Some people still repeat the meaningless slogan of Marshall McLuhan about a "global village". For

McLuhan the new communication technology was all-important, as if that technology put the Indian village directly in touch with sophisticated Manhattan modems. The globe does not look like a village at all. It has some features of the jungle, where wild beasts are prowling, and the meek and the lowly are defenceless and scared stiff.

For a few years at least, the cause of the poor and the oppressed, of the victims of injustice and exploitation, will have to move to the back burner. They will continue to be galley slaves and hewers of stone for the market economy masters for some more time, until their pent up wrath explodes into a turbulent storm which will rock the western world and Japan as well. If that explosion is to be creative, some democratic form of socialism offering equal opportunities for all to work and to live a dignified human life will have to come back. International democracy and less global inequity seem difficult to achieve through normal negotiations and dialogue within the prevailing market economy world order.

2. And Whither India?

There is no doubt that India has been forced into the market economy world, primarily as the only option for an economy which has been brutally messed up by a series of uncomprehending or unthinking prime ministers. The late Rajiv Gandhi, and his successors in office, V P Singh and Chandra Sekhar took from the national treasury what they could not replace. They spent recklessly without counting the cost or worrying about where the money is to come from. The result has been a complex of acute foreign exchange deficit, mammoth budget deficit, soaring inflation and a crushingly increased debt burden. It is gratifying to note that there has been some improvement recently in the foreign exchange reserves.

The IMF Loan with its 'conditionality' terms and the Man Mohan Singh reforms together have succeeded in decisively reversing the socialist trend in our land. The old dreams about a socialist public sector controlling the commanding heights of the economy are now finally dissipated. It is a free for all now. Those who have money and management power will now control the commanding heights of the economy. The rest of us simply have to dance to their tunes, too often on fairly empty stomachs.

With insoluble problems in the Punjab and Kashmir, an appalling rise in terrorism, and growing tensions with Pakistan, we in India will spend an intolerably increasing part of our limited resources on Defence and Security. Since the connection between defense contracts and the funding of the political process has not yet been broken, a higher defense budget will of course be in the interest of the politicians.

Prime Minister Narasimha Rao who has a reputation for integrity and incorruptibility has proved himself to be the man of the hour for India. How long it will be before his leadership would be undermined, it is too early to predict.

We should be grateful that the Babri Masjid Ram Janmabhoomi issue is being effectively tackled by the Rao Government. Even the BJP stands to gain by cooperating in evolving a peaceful settlement of the dispute, and BJP leadership has begun to show real signs of statesmanship. The Varanasi riots may not be of the BJP's or VHP's doing. Forces have long been operative in our country which use communal tensions to destabilise our economy and society.

This is a time for special prayers for our nation and people. Vigilance, wisdom and restraint are demanded from all of us in India.

3. Churches in the Former Soviet Union Face a Bewildering situation.

Many people thought that the churches in Eastern Europe had been near completely suppressed by the Communist regimes, and, now that Communism has fallen, that the Churches are jubilant in their newfound freedom. That is far from true on both counts: the churches had been growing quite a bit under the oppressive communist regimes and were steadily gaining increasing freedom to carry on a limited range of activities: they are now far from ready or equipped with trained personnel and appropriate institutions to face the new situation with all its opportunities and challenges.

During the Communist period the churches of Eastern Europe had two openings towards the outside world. They virtually ran the Christian Peace Conference, through which they could pursue certain objectives acceptable to the regimes, like the search for peace with justice; it brought people from other churches to their countries and gave some of their leaders to travel abroad and contact other nations

and churches. Since 1961 membership in the World Council of Churches brought fresh contacts and new stimulation. Now these are no longer high on the priority list of the Eastern European churches.

A new day has indeed dawned - a day of freedom exhilarating at onset, but placing the churches before daunting challenges. In Russia, for example, several thousands of churches have been reopened; the difficulty now is to supply competent priests to man them. The Orthodox Church is now permitted to print Russian Bibles in cooperation with the United Bible Societies; the difficulty now is to establish a sufficient number of centres for their distribution. The Indian Bible Societies are now receiving hundreds of thousands of letters from Russia, requesting a free Russian Bible; every one who applies gets one. But the demand is for millions of copies of the Russian Bible alone. Orthodox Seminaries have been reopened in Odessa, Minsk and Kiev and elsewhere. In addition to the previously existing ones in Moscow and St. Petersburg. Thousands of priests are being trained, but the quality of the training leaves much to be desired.

But there is a debit side. The great Russian Orthodox Church which till recently had some 80 million members, has now been sadly broken up. The church in the Ukraine has become separate and autonomous, facing aggressive missions from churches of the West. Proselytism is rampant. Both the Roman Catholic Church and the Protestant sects seem to have no compunction about fishing in troubled waters and using the weakness of the Ukrainian church for stealing its sheep. It is true that many of the Ukrainian Christians had for a time, under Polish occupation, Roman Catholics. But it does not seem very Christian to overlook the fact that the Ukrainian Church, which was the original Russian Orthodox Church from the time of its establishment under Prince Vladimir in the 10th century, has for a much longer period been Orthodox. The Ukrainian Church is now divided into three groups: the autonomous Exarchate with continuing connections with the Russian Orthodox, the independent Ukrainian Church and the Uniat Roman Catholic dioceses.

The Moldavians in the former Soviet Union are now gravitating towards the Romanian Church. This is more understandable, since Moldavia was formerly Romanian. But the Russians in Moldavia object. In general the Russian Orthodox outside Russia, Byelorussia and Ukraine have suddenly become minorities in the new republics.

In Armenia, the Armenian Orthodox Church seems

to be in a comfortable position, free now from Russian domination. The 3.5 million people of the new Republic of Armenia are nearly all Armenian Orthodox. Catholicos Vazken of Etchmiadzin, aged 84, now enjoys high prestige in the republic. The new President Mr. Derpatrossian is himself a Biblical scholar and former seminary teacher. He was inducted into office in November by the Catholicos himself. Where once they were dominated by a communist Council of Religious Affairs, now that Council is completely Armenian Orthodox and chaired by Mr. Khatchadrian, a devout Armenian Orthodox. The difficulty, however, is that the small republic itself is on a very unsound economic basis. Your editor visited the capital city of Yerevan in November. There is no electricity, gas or oil. No street lights at night. There are only three flights out of the country and even these find it difficult to find fuel which has to come from outside. This winter is going to be hard. Neighbours, like Russia, Ukraine, Georgia, Azerbaijan and Turkey are all hostile and the Armenians have a sense of acute claustrophobia. Underneath there is even an unspoken fear of invasion or occupation by hostile nations. The Armenians have not had a nation of their own for centuries. The winter has brought extreme suffering to the areas hit by the earthquake a few years ago. And there is virtually war with Azerbaijan, about the disputed territory of Nagorno-Karabakh, more than 80% Armenian, which Azerbaijanis claim as their territory.

In the Russian Republics, there is a further tension within the Orthodox, Baptist and other churches. The leaders are being accused of having compromised with the communists in the past; some are accused of having served as KGB moles within the Church.

The situations are all in different ways, bewildering. The churches need our prayers and sympathies.

THE PERIL THAT UNITES—THE NUCLEAR WINTER AND SPACE
WAR THREATS AS A DEMAND FOR GLOBAL HUMAN UNITY

(Dr. Paulos Mar Gregorios)

It is indeed a privilege for me to be invited to deliver the Sir C. Sankaran Nair memorial lecture this year. We no longer produce in Kerala the calibre of people who can match the integrity, erudition, character and vision of a Sir C. Sankaran Nayar. We have become a generation that puts too high value on undelayed gratification of our desires and instincts. We want to "enjoy" life in a way which is more animal than human. We no longer share in any great common suffering of our community. Nor do we have many persons today in our midst who strive sacrificially for the welfare and liberation of the whole people, as some had to do in the days of the anti-imperialist freedom struggle of the first half of our century. Today we focus more on maximum^{izing} the share we can get out of the common kitty, than on how heroically^{ly} we can contribute to the fulfilment and freedom of all people. Let me pay tribute at this juncture not only to Sir C. Sankaran Nair, who lived in order that he may serve, but also to two other members of that lineage - my very dear friend the late K.P.S. Menon and the dynamic daughter of the family, Mrs Anujee Menon who is, by the grace of God, still present in our midst in full vigour and active good health.

As a child I had heard of Chettur Sankaran Nair not only as a heroic figure in opposing British Imperialism and its ways, but also as a middle class critic of Mahatma Gandhi's ways of opposing that imperialism. Sankaran Nair

was a constitutionalist to the hilt. He wanted British rule to go, but by strictly constitutional and not agitational methods. And that is one of the issues that I want to raise in this paper.

There is a new peril - a composite global peril much more capable of devastation than British Imperialism. In the face of this new peril, do we as the world's people resort to strictly legal and constitutional methods, or do we have to take to the agitational road ?

I hope an understanding of the nature of the peril will itself provide the answer to the question about the path we have to follow in removing that peril hanging above the human race.

The recognition of British Imperialism as a peril united Sir C. Sankaran Nair and Mahatma Gandhi in a common effort to remove the British Yoke. Will the recognition of the new imperialism that frightens the world and holds it prisoner, unite all of us in humanity to a common struggle against it ? That is the question.

x

x

x

I said the peril that faces humanity today is a composite one. It has many elements in it, but I shall refer only to four of these:

- (a) The Space and Nuclear Threat;
- (b) Poverty and The Captivity of Science and Technology;
- (c) The nature of the Military - Industrial - Financial - Communication Complex
- (d) The cultural-educational imperialism that saps our vitality.

These are four aspects of a single peril which I submit, is a spur from God, from history if you prefer, goading us on to find a new way of making it possible for all human beings to live together as a single humanity on this planet, in dignity and freedom.

I The Nuclear and Space War Peril

Some years ago to talk about peace was itself regarded as Russian or communist propaganda. Today intelligent and informed people know that it is no propaganda at all. Even our late Prime Minister ^{Indira Gandhi and our present Prime Minister} Rajiv Gandhi have given the avoidance of nuclear war top place in the Non-Aligned Movement agenda. Till Yesterday it was possible for the peoples of the world to wish away the problem of nuclear war as a western problem, as a European concern. And in the back of the minds of many in our lands lurked the wicked thought: "those bloody westerners, they have had it so good for so long, let them destroy themselves".

Today we cannot afford that luxury. A nuclear war anywhere in the world would be our problem, the concern of the human race as a whole, for all human and other life would be endangered by even a limited nuclear war anywhere on our planet.

The publication of two scientific papers at the end of 1983 in Science magazine raised the issue of the Nuclear Winter. The first was a short paper - hardly ten printed pages with the notes, entitled "Nuclear Winter : Global consequences of Multiple Nuclear Explosions" (Science, Vol 222:No. 4630, 23rd December 1983, pp 1283-1292). This paper came to be known as the T- TAPS paper, taking the first letters of the names of its five authors - Turco, Toon, Ackerman, Pollack and Sagan. Except the last, Carl Sagan, the others are fairly unknown quiet research scientists working with

NASA or private research centres like R & D Associates in California. But their little paper has now made history. The second paper, in the same Science magazine (pp 1293-1300), is entitled "Long-Term Biological consequences of Nuclear War" produced by a team of international scientists - twenty of them- meeting at Cambridge, Massachussetts, U.S.A.

The points of these papers have been more elaborately worked out and the papers themselves included in a book by Paul Ehrlich, Carl Sagan et al, The Cold and The Dark - The World after Nuclear War, (W.W.Norton, N.Y., London, 1984)

The main point is this. Even a limited nuclear war, using only 1% of our present nuclear arsenals, over a heavily populated and built up urban area, can cause the destruction of the very possibility of human existence on our planet. A major nuclear war, with say one-third of our present arsenals, according to the scientists, "will produce, among its many plausible effects, the greatest biological and physical disruptions of this planet in its last 65 million years - a period 100 times the life-span of our species so far". (The Cold and the Dark, p. 160)

The scientific study was based on computer models previously developed to measure the effects of volcanic eruptions. The main effects, apart from the immediate destruction caused by a nuclear attack (fire,) is the soot and dust

(b) in temperature drops caused by the soot and dust clouds above our planet. The clouds may be as high as 30 km above, will spread all over the globe, and will remain for several weeks or months, shutting out all light causing a long night in which photosynthesis by leaves cannot take place.

The fire damage itself is incredible. There are five stages -

1. The flash of bomb light burns out all flammable materials over a large area, depending on the size of the warhead.

2. The blast from the explosion smashes buildings and ignites secondary fires;

3. As the fire-ball from the explosion rises, huge, fierce, convective winds over the burning area, blowing the other fires and spreading them ;

4. In urban areas, the individual fires merge to form a fire-storm, strong winds, blazing fires, clouds of smoke rising, probably also some thick black rain;

5. A burnt out city covered by a pall of acrid, radio-active, smoke cloud.

(The Cold and the Dark pp 82-83)

...7

According to both US and USSR scientists, about 40 days after the soot and dust cloud rises, the temperature in the northern hemisphere would drop by 20^{degree} centigrade. In Ottapalam if the December temperature is 25° it will become 5°. How many will die in that cold? In cooler climates like Delhi, if December temperature is 10° above 0, it will become 10° below. Millions will die of the cold.

Even 8 months after the blast in Europe, Ottapalam temperatures would be 10° below normal.

In the western part of the USA, the temperature drop 40 days after the explosion could be as high as 30° centigrade, in the Eastern U.S. even 40° centigrade, over Europe as much as 50°. In the Soviet Union the drop could be more than 30° below normal. Meanwhile above the clouds, in the Himalayas, the Alps and the Rockies, the intense heat would melt the ice and floods would follow. The floods could drown the whole of India or the whole of Europe or U.S.A. The winds and storms caused by temperature changes and floods would be unpredictably destructive. ~~Toxic-and-floods-would-be-unpredictably-destructive~~ Toxic gases and epidemics will also spread. The gene pool of all life would be seriously endangered.

Following the conference in the U.S.A. on "The World After Nuclear War" - reported in detail in The Cold and the Dark, there was a TV conference between Soviet and American scientists.

It is the report on this TV conference that most impressed me. There was total, complete, agreement between Soviet and American scientists. Dr. Thomas F. Malone, who moderated the US Soviet scientific discussion across the Atlantic said

"It seems to me that this conference and this exchange of views may well turn out in years ahead to be viewed - correctly - as the turning point in the affairs of mankind"

The conclusion from the scientific study on nuclear winter is crystal clear - nuclear weapons have no right to exist, if life is to exist on this planet. Humanity will be safe on this planet only if nuclear weapons are totally and completely eliminated. There must be an international ban on the developing, testing, manufacturing stockpiling, deploying and using of nuclear weapons.

The logical next steps are also crystal clear. The most immediate next steps are

(a) total and immediate closing down of all manufacturing establishments for nuclear weapons and their delivery systems. This can be called freeze, moratorium or better "Nuclear Close Down ". This ~~is~~ should happen in U.S.A., U.S.S.R., Britain, France, China and in all other countries where such facilities exist.

(b) a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty that forbids nuclear tests in air, water, underground, or space.

(c) a total ban on all nuclear weapons research and development, and the closing down of all projects related to development or improvement of nuclear weapons and delivery systems.

(d) an immediate negotiated treaty for the dismantling and disposal of all existing arsenals of nuclear weapons and delivery systems in a joint international project.

(e) an immediate crash programme for the conversion of the nuclear research and production system to peaceful uses, retraining and reemployment of all workers in nuclear or related establishments in peaceful production - particularly related to the problems of poverty ill-health and ignorance in the world.

II. The Star Wars

The above are the logical steps. But the way we are proceeding now is in the opposite direction most illogical. The two leading nuclear powers are adding to their arsenals, and improving the quality of their warheads and delivery systems. There is an average increase of at least three new nuclear warheads every day. All are involved in making the delivery systems more precise, reducing the C.E.P. or circular error probability.

Why ? The ostensible reason is the strategic Defence Initiative of the U.S. Administration. This strategy claims to be for defense, and ^{to be} meant to make nuclear weapons obsolete.

In fact, however, the S.D.I or Star Wars scenario is a scheme to use nuclear weapons for a

decapitating first strike. If there are no nuclear weapons, S.D.I. would have absolutely no purpose whatsoever. And if we can build an "absolutely safe" space shield, the enemy's nuclear weapons also would be of no use. But the U.S. administration, while building the "space shield" also goes on increasing the number of warheads with which to destroy the enemy. There are plans to build 20 giant OHIO missile submarines, four of which have already been commissioned. MX Intercontinental Missiles are being developed for use in 198⁶. Trident-2 missiles are scheduled for commissioning in 1989. The B-1 B heavy bomber is already ready.

There is no reason to believe that the Soviet Union is sitting idle in the face of these developments: We have very little information about Soviet preparations. But we know some things :

(a) A space-based anti-ballistic missile system is most vulnerable. It is a sitting duck. It costs only 0.1% of the cost of an ABM in space, to shoot it down or decapitate it.

(b) Laser beams making a hole in a war-head or its rocket is the main point of S.D.I. The technology for covering warheads and delivery rockets with laser-deflecting coating is already making progress.

(c) A space shield is totally useless against low flying cruise missiles, bombers and submarine launchers which can all deliver decapitating nuclear knock-outs.

(d) Even if the space-shield overcomes all technical problems now known, its efficiency cannot exceed 95% according to all scientific estimates. The remaining 5% of a 5000 war head attack will let 250 warheads through - more than enough to destroy a nation.

These are facts well known to the US administration. Then why do they go on with such an expensive programme which does not give them real security ? There are two possible scenarios.

The first is that the S.D.I. is part of a "decapitating first strike" strategy. Once the space-based ABMs are in orbit, there will be a massive U.S. attack on the Soviet Silos and war-heads, as well as on the command centres of the USSR, so that the retaliatory strike will be small, and most of that can be stopped by the space shield. Even if 20 or 30 warheads hit the U.S. breaking through the shield, and cause the death of a few million Americans, this will be an "acceptable" price to pay for permanently destroying the USSR.

The second scenario in the minds of the US administration strategists is even more sinister. When the U.S. prepares for a first strike, the USSR will not sit idle. It will have to start preparing its own space-based defence, and increase its arsenal. At the present state of the socialist economies, they cannot bear the cost of this without affecting the present

growth in standards of living in socialist countries, which is growing much faster than in the capitalist countries. The economic strain of higher military expenditure will be felt by the socialist consumer, and he/she will rise up in revolt against the socialist regimes. This is the fond hope of some of President Reagan's advisors.

Look at what will happen if we go in for a Nuclear Close Down and disarmament. Immediately a very large number of corporations in the world will collapse, since they are now supported by the defence budgets. In fact the whole capitalistic system based on credits and loans may itself collapse. On the other hand, since military production is in the hands of the socialist governments in socialist countries (and not in the hands of private contractors and sub-contractors), they can re-organize production completely and find employment for all now engaged in war production. Disarmament will mean a shooting up of the standard of living in socialist countries, and many of them will out strip western market economy countries in standard of living. This will be too much of a triumph for socialism. This is what the U.S. administration and its allies want ^{at} ~~to~~ present. And therefore a Nuclear Close Down is something they must avoid, by accelerating the arms race and making the socialist countries spend more.

The risk in all this is that a little mis-calculation, a little computer error, a little spark of foolishness on the part of decision makers on the U.S. side or the

U.S.S.R. side, can send all life on our planet into holocaust and oblivion.

III. The Economic Beneficiaries

But who benefits from all this ? Certainly not President Reagan, who only develops polyps in the colon and lumps on the nose. What does the face of the culprit behind all this look like ? It is a face difficult to draw. But we will sketch a cartoon of that face by calling it the Military-Industrial - Finance - Information complex or MIFIC for short. The MIFIC is the power behind the arms race and the war hysteria, and the main obstacle to solving the problems of poverty and injustice within and among nations.

The Market Economy World sustains a very precarious balance, if it has any. ~~since~~ Since 1979 the capitalist world has been in one of its worst crises. The system has outlived many crises in the past. Many prophecies about the imminent collapse of the system have proved false.

The most dramatic symbol of that crisis is the enormous debt burden of the poor countries and rich countries alike. The debt burden of the poor has been much publicised in recent times. But the public debt of countries like the U.S.A. is equally staggering. And by keeping interest rates very high and keeping dollar values inflated the U.S. has been drawing money

from other countries into its economy, and imposing a very cruel burden on those to whom it has lent money.

Look at Latin America, for example. The foreign debt burden, and the percentage of export earnings needed for debt service payments goes like this:

	Debt dollars	Percentage of export earnings for debt services
Argentina	\$ 48 bill	52%
Bolivia	\$ 4 bill	57%
Mexico	\$ 96 bill	36.6%
Brazil	\$105 bill	36.5%
Chile	\$ 23 bill	45.5%
Peru	\$ 14 bill	35.5%

The total debt of the six Latin American countries is \$ 290 billion. If you take the other L.A. countries also into account it is \$ 400 billion. They have to pay out about \$ 80 billion each year for debt servicing. This burden falls on 130 million people in L.A. i.e. a debt of more than \$ 3000 per person. It is impossible for them to pay this debt. The debt is ~~the result of~~ the result of Shylockian exploitation - through unequal trade terms, through the plundering activities of TNC's and the machinations of international finance.

The debt is unpayable. Fidel Castro of Cuba recently gave a brilliant mathematical demonstration of this fact. Even the best terms offered by the creditors will not help. Take four sets of terms.

1. A ten year grace period for repayment during which period only interest will be paid. After ten years, the debt is to ^{be} amortized in ten equal annual instalments, the rate of interest to be paid being about 10% ;

In this case Latin America will pay \$ 400 billion in the first ten years to the creditor countries, (to the MIFIC) and an additional 600 billion in the next ten years - provided they don't take any new loans from now. So in 20 years 1000 billion dollars will go out from L.A. to the MIFIC. This is impossible.

2. Another possibility is that Latin American debtor countries are asked to pay only 20% of the value of their total exports each year for 20 years, which will go towards amortisation and interest payment. Present L.A. exports are ~~\$~~ 100 billion, or ^a little less. So the annual payments will be only \$ 20 billion. Supposing the Latin American nations can manage to pay that much. What is the situation at the end of 20 years. \$ 400 billion has been paid out, and the calculation shows that the debt that remains to be paid will be ~~\$~~ 1,161.85 billion in place of the present ~~\$~~ 400 billion ! It does not work either.

3. Supposing ^{they} to say, for ten years you pay nothing, neither capital payments nor interest. Then in the next ten years you clear the capital and the interest accrued. This works for the first ten years. But in the next ten years ^{1447.31}~~1447.31~~ billion will have to be paid. This is impossible.

4. The kindest of the formulas would be a reduction of the rate of interest to about 6% and an additional ten years to repay. Still Latin America would have to shell out \$ 857.47 billion.

The question has been seriously raised if the MIFIC can survive if it writes off the whole debt. Some think the whole system will collapse. Others disagree. There are proposals that the Western Bankers can float bonds that will take care of the loan amounts. I am not competent to judge the feasibility and utility of this proposal.

Of one thing I am, however, sure. The money supposedly owed by the 100 or more nations of the Two-third world is but a fraction of the amount of wealth that has been taken out of these countries by the colonial and neo-colonial nations in the last 100 years.

This debt has therefore to be adjusted - most of it written off. But along with the writing off ^{of} the debt, unless the trade terms are made more equitable and the international finance system brought under

genuine international control, Two-third world countries will continue to accumulate unpayable debts again. That is the way the present Market Economy world order is set up - to facilitate the flow of Two-third world countries' wealth into a few rich countries.

That is why we have to consider the extent to which the arms manufacture and trade as well as the arms race fulfill also the function of upholding and defending this unjust economic order.

6% of the world's Gross Domestic Product is today used for defence or military expenditure. But in working out a new and more just economic order, we have to worry about more than just the 6% that is now spent for arms. We need to worry about how the remaining 94% of the production of the Market Economy world exercises power over the Two-third world countries. The MIFIC has now set up its own agencies in all Two-third world countries including China, and is seeking to keep this empire in tact through the Arms Race, which is needed to keep the arms market expanding and to finance the political systems that favour the MIFIC. They control industrial technology, international finance, and the information media. The military spending is the key to the keeping of the MIFIC in power.

I wish to submit therefore that we will not get very far with disarmament so long as this MIFIC has its power. Unless we direct our opposition directly on the MIFIC itself, the movements for peace cannot ultimately succeed.

The need of the hour is a strategy to expose the ways of operation of this MIFIC, in order that the moral conscience of the general public would be aroused.

IV The Culture of Violence

The militaristic exploitative culture that has grown up in the last forty years is an extremely violent and heartless one. One symptom of that violence is the number of small wars since 1945.

Can you believe that since the Second World War ended in 1945, during the 37 years till 1982, 20 ~~mm~~ million people have been killed in something like 150 "small" wars in various parts of the Two-third world? The world War military casualties were 17 million - mostly in Europe.

World military expenditures ~~have~~ shot up from about \$ 400 billion in 1968 to \$ 800 billion in 1983, and is now approaching 1000 billion. 70% of that was spent by the six major military powers, but the military expenditure in the Two-third world has also shot up to produce repressive military regimes galore in Asia, Africa and ~~kndm~~ Latin America. Half of Africa's 52 nations are governed by military-dominated regimes.

International arms trade went up from \$ 10 billion in 1968 to more than ~~\$~~35 billion today. The Soviet Union has also exported weapons - to countries like India, and to many socialist countries. In 1983 Soviet arms export to non-socialist countries in the

Two-third world was 50% of their total export to these countries. However, in relation to the total world Arms trade, the Soviet Union's share has been declining. France, Britain, Germany and Spain are moving up fast to make maximum profit out of the arms market. The U.S.A. is still the leading exporter of arms accounting for 40% of the total U.S.S.R. share in 1984 was 32%.

The stockpile of chemical weapons is fast increasing. There is no law against the manufacture and stockpiling of chemical weapons, but only against their use. Even this law is now known to be violated - by Iraq in the war against Iran, but there has been as yet no U.N. condemnation of this violation. Besides USA and USSR, also France, Iraq and according to the C.I.A., a dozen other countries have now chemical weapons. The U.S. Congress has not yet approved funding for chemical weapons.

In 1984, we had 52 nuclear explosions ~~by way of~~ by way of weapons tests - most by the U.S.A. and the USSR. In 1984 we had also two advances in the military use of outer space. The U.S.A. tested its F- 15 aircraft with the anti-satellite missile and warhead; it also successfully tested a BMD interceptor for tracking and shooting down missiles and warheads above the atmosphere, using non-nuclear kinetic-energy weapons.

We have a culture in which, for every 100,000 of the world population we have 556 soldiers trained to kill, and only 85 doctors trained to heal. For every soldier the world spends ~~an~~ ^{an} average of \$ 20,000 a year,

while for every child in school we spend only \$380 (world average). And in a country, like India, the military expenditure keeps going up, while the poverty of the millions remains unabated or grows.

People feel powerless, frustrated and desperate about such oppressive military violence in the world. Some give expression to counter-violence of the terrorist kind, such as we see on the part of the Lebanese and the Sikh extremists.

There is another kind of violence which has not been adequately studied on a world scale. Amnesty International has done some work on Human Rights violations by governments. I have just recently visited El Salvador, which is today probably the worst case.

In El Salvador, the country where Archbishop Oscar Romero was shot dead while celebrating Holy Mass at his cathedral, with the undoubted support of the army, more than 50,000 human beings (civilians) have been assassinated in the last six years, by death squads of the El Salvador army. 6000 people have disappeared, without any trace of where their dead bodies have been disposed.

I spoke personally to one of the mothers of the disappeared. Let me recount to you what she said to me:

" My name is Maria Martinez. My eldest son, Luis, 26 years old, was the mainstay of our family. On a Wednesday in March, at 1.00 in the morning, soldiers in civilian clothes came and took my boy. I tried to stop them. I am a poor and physically weak woman. I work during the day washing floors to support my family. I asked the soldiers: 'Why are you taking away my boy.' The response of the soldiers was to beat me on my face, on my back, everywhere on my frail body. I persisted with my questions.

"They took me out of the house, took me to a mango tree in our yard, and ~~me~~ began beating me. This time they used rifle butts on my body. I fell down, exhausted and broken. By the time I was able to get up, they were gone with my son. I tried to run after the jeep. They pointed their guns~~s~~ at me and told me to stop. I recognized the Cherokee jeep of the army, and went back into the house.

"Luis, my son, was married a year ago, and his young wife and six-day-old baby were living with me. I took care of the baby. But I had to go and find my son. I looked for his body everywhere, in ravines and morgues, in coffee plantations and cemeteries. At that time there was a ^{cur}few at 7 p.m. The ~~s~~treets were full of police, army and national guard. At first I avoided ~~s~~treets, and looked only in mountains and fields and ravines. For a whole month I searched.

"In the process I found many bodies - many of them decapitated and disfigured - faces, arms and legs chopped off. I saw a mass grave where a group of young girls in their early teens had been raped, killed and disposed of by the wayside I saw many mass graves. Sometimes soldiers would try to stop me from seeing these, but I persisted. I had lost my fear. I saw bodies piled up in trucks, covered with cloth. I asked to see the bodies to look for my son. The soldiers would not let me. I saw that these bodies were being taken to El Playon, the secret cemetery on the beach. I looked there too, but to no effect".

At that point ^{my colleague} Dr Marga Bührig asked her: "How do you get the courage to do all this and to continue protesting? Do you have no fears?"

Maria replied: "We are mothers. We, mothers of the disappeared, started organizing ourselves here. We walked in the mountains, sometimes alone, sometimes in groups, looking for our sons' bodies. We lost our fear in the process of digging up fresh graves, examining disintegrating dead bodies with our hands."

Another mother, much younger, joined in the conversation: "All of us wanted to find our children. So we organized ourselves as the "Comite de Madres de Presos y desaparecidos politicos". Monsignor Oscar Romero, our beloved Archbishop, who was killed by the military while at mass, supported us. He announced in church about our committee and invited other mothers of the disappeared to join us. He asked ^{us} ~~the~~ mothers to ~~unite~~ ^{unite} working towards unconditional freeing of all political

prisoners, and to work for justice also against the criminals who are doing all this. We occupied the headquarters of the International Red Cross. We marched into embassies, churches, and other institutions to tell them about our committee and our demands. ¶ "Then Government turned its persecution against us mothers. In 1982, one of the mothers in the Committee disappeared. Her thirteen year old daughter Anna Yamina was also taken. Another mother Elena Gonzales was killed by men whom we know".

She continued: "President Duarte says there is democracy in this country. A few weeks ago on June 12th, this office of the Committee was broken in and raided. They broke the roof to get in. They broke ^{open} our desks and took two cassette recorders and cassette tapes. They stole the \$ 10,000 which had been given to us that day by a delegation visiting us. They took dossiers, photo albums, birth certificates and many other documents. These invaders were national guard in civilian clothes. The National Guard, armed and in uniform stood guard while all this was going on. Many people saw them.

"So many of us have been suffering torture and oppression for so long. We fight. We fight not just for our loved ones, but for our whole people of El Salvador. 50,000 people have been assassinated. 6,000 have been detained or disappeared. We mothers put our suffering together and made it a moral force to denounce the suffering of other people and to put an end to human rights violations. They killed our founder-president Marianella Garcia-Villos, a great lawyer and a great

human being. They killed our Patron and Supporter Monseigneur Oscar Romero. They have assassinated three others of our mothers. Three of our workers have disappeared. They placed explosives in our old office and blew it up. Many of us receive threatening phone calls. But we are not demoralized. We shall go on, until our people can live in peace, justice and freedom!

In El Salvador, even today, the army goes and bombs its own villages, because the village people are alleged to support the Salvadorian ^u guerrillas who fight against the army's atrocities. The Roman Catholic Church in El Salvador has trained ^{tens} ~~thousands~~ of thousands of catechetical workers to spread literacy in these villages. 4000 of these lay workers of the Church were assassinated by the army between 1977 and 1982, according to what the Archbishop's office told us. The present Archbishop, the successor of Mgr Oscar Romero, ^u Monsignor Rivera y Damas has also been threatened with death by the death squads. When I was in San Salvador, there was a full-page advertisement in the local newspaper, taken out by nine university professors who had received notices from the death squads that they were going to be assassinated.

As the villages are bombed and raided by the military, ~~many~~ many flee from the villages to the city of El Salvador - most of them widows and orphans. In the city the churches have been running ~~many~~ refugios, temporary shelters where such ^{of} refugees can find food

who had thus fled. One such widow, with six children, the ~~g~~ youngest a six weeks old baby in her hand, told me her story. The soldiers took her husband, because they thought he was a guerrilla supporter. In the presence of the wife and children they tortured him, took out his eyes, cut his face and mouth in several places to disfigure him, and then finally slit his throat with a sharp knife.

Who supports this army? Why are they so powerful? They have three sources of support. More than 60% of El Salvador's poor people are openly opposed to the army and the government of Mr. Duarte put ~~there~~ ^{there} by the U.S. government. The army, in public, is not supported even by the government. But the government cannot control the army. The army's support, as I ~~said~~ said, comes from three sources - the oligarchy, the Trans-National Corporations, and the U.S. administration. 116 families (about a thousand people) concentrate in their hands 67% of the total domestic product of the country, and support the army, though not fully. 52 gigantic business enterprises, in which the TNC's are the dominant element, and which are controlled by the TNC-oligarchy alliance, account for 80% of the total industrial and agricultural production in the country. Since January 1981 till January 1985, the U.S. administration has pumped at least \$ 2000 million dollars into this system. Even now the U.S. spends $1\frac{1}{2}$ million dollars a day to support this system. And the western media co-operate in not giving much publicity to these inhuman acts. This is what the MIFIC does in many countries in Central America ~~and~~ ⁱⁿ Chile and elsewhere.

Can you not understand why there is counter-violence in this world ? Why people, in their frustration and desperation, turn suicidally to violence as ^a solution to the problem of oppressive force in the world ?

This cult of violence is spreading in our country. The story of the violence perpetrated against Harijans by Bihar- U.P. landlords and traders has yet to be told ⁱⁿ by our media. There are so many stories of police violence in our own country. We saw in Delhi the mindless violence of ~~of~~ our leading political party during the sequ~~el~~ to the brutal assassination of our beloved Prime Minister Indira Gandhi. We see new upsurges of violence in dowry deaths and rapes.

The human Sub-conscious is aware that justice is at a premium in all lands, and the poor cannot have access to justice. It is this that promotes the culture of violence, assassinations, torture and terrorism. The nuclear-~~space~~ space peril has a major role in fomenting this culture of violence.

But if humanity can ^{unite} ~~unite~~ today against this culture of violence, that is the positive side of the opportunity before us. Sir C.Sankaran Nayar and others were inspired to sacrifice their career and wealth to fight the injustice of British Imperialism. Sir.C. thought, not in terms of his personal interests, or those of his village and region. He stood up for the people ^{of} India.

We need today something bigger than just nationalism and the national freedom movement led by Gandhi, Nehru and others. We need an international freedom movement, in which the peoples of the world unite to overthrow the power of the MIFIC, and to lay the foundations of a New International War-less, Just, Political, Economic and Information Order, where all human beings can live together in peace and security, with justice and dignity, and without violence and exploitation.

Can the peril that faces us, in the unyielding arms race, in the cult of militarism and violence, in Nuclear Winter and Star Wars, in oppressive injustice and exploitation, unite the human race to a new international and global consciousness with commitment to justice, peace and human dignity ? That is the call of the hour. That is also the challenge I wish humbly to leave with you. Thank you for hearing me out. God bless you all, and also our human race.

perceived the unity between the

Human unity, exist - between two
poles - its transcendental origin, and ground
between the one bound, and ^{on the other,} the boundless
universe it is integrally related. The latter
point is easier to grasp, though often
forgotten. If the sun ~~does~~ ^{did} not shine
on life on earth could not exist. And
that sun is a point in a remote billion
other galaxies - galaxies in which
all things are interconnected. The
earth, with its oceans and lakes, rivers
and wind-blown, mountains and clouds
trees and bees, animals and the
humans - an integral part of
life. My life could not exist if that
universe did not sustain it and support
it. And the only one dimension of that vast and
complex universe is open to our senses.

I became a human being
by interacting with the earth
consciously through work and unconscious
through my breathing and blood circulation
my food and drink intake and elimination
systems, and through the thousands of other
unconscious processes going on in
my body and mind as well as
around me

we

a

system

cal.

our

Electricity came only in 1878, the telephone in 1876, the typewriter in 1873 and the railway and telegraph in 1866.

There was an air of excitement about the new technology which revolutionized our interaction with the earth and our environment. Justified excitement indeed, but what a mess our industrial system has got us into!

Our problem today is that the earth is reacting rather negatively to our high-handed industrial-technological handling of it. In fact all the three problems we confront today, injustice, war and environmental deterioration are directly related to our sci/tech based industrial system and the neo-colonial system which has grown up with the industrial system. We have been too unrestrained and immature in our handling of the earth and ⁱⁿ our relationship with human beings on it. The working version of the christian religion has

Conjuring humanity to such a ~~precarious~~
Hubris and Greed, desire for domination
and property, have ruined the human
Race and its environment, exposing us
and all life to the risk of extinction.

The religions of the world
have now to work together to redeem
humanity from its ^{present} precarious predicament.
We need to liberate humanity from the
secular trap in which it has been
unconsciously caught. Modern science
and the technology based on it, as well
as the political economy that undergirds
it have developed in a secular
framework where ~~we~~ humanity as
dominating subject and the world
as ~~pass~~ passive object have been the
only two factors that mattered. God
or the transcendent has become an
unnecessary hypothesis — in our science/tech,
in our universities and schools, in our political institutions.

This is the secular trap from
which humanity needs emancipation.
It is not simply a question of bringing
in God through the window. Philosophical
theisms are all ~~too~~ philosophically
weak ~~that~~ to stand. It is not simply
at the intellectual or conceptual level
that the Transcendent has to be

The various religions of the world have honoured and cherished the experience of the transcendent, throughout human history, despite the scathing secular attack. We have done so through our doctrines and practices, through our prayers and rituals, through our mystic quests and experiences, through our compassion for humanity and our devotion to the Source and Ground of all being.

Of course in religion too we have made a mess of things, as in our science/technology. We have made religion an instrument of our greed for political power and for economic advantage. We have allowed the most ungodly and inhuman practices in the name of religion. We have fought wars and destroyed each other in the name of God and religion. We have used our crusades and our jihads to plunder and pilfer the wealth of other peoples.

Religion too needs emancipation. We as humanity ~~are~~ ^{stand} now alienated, by our own evil practices, from both poles of our existence, ^{from} the transcendent Source and Ground of our being and from the earth and society in which we have been placed.

The two redemptions, the overcoming of the two alienations, i.e. in the two realms of transcendent religion and

and political economy, the double salvation for which humanity yearns, must become the top concern of the global boncove of Religions. The two emancipations can come only as a single package. It is only as our religions cease being negative and exclusive that our science-technology and our political economy also become more human.

The secular trap in which we have languished for ~~a few centuries~~ more than a century since the European Enlightenment must be recognized as such - a trap. The world is not secular. It did not come into being by itself, nor is it able to exist without contingent dependence on its source and ground.

Our science-technology and our political economies have no doubt made great gains operating in a secular framework where the transcendent is totally ignored and even held as taboo.

We are today at a stage where we can move out of that secular bind to a new humanitarian, ~~global~~ compassionate, non-exclusive global boncove of Religions. That way we will find our way to a new science/technology and a new political economy which

To me this is the vision that beckons. We shall not abandon critical reason, but we shall go beyond it to find a more compassionate, more human, more transcendent-acknowledging kind of reason. We do not abandon our national loyalties, but we shall go beyond them to keep global human interests above our national interests. We do not abandon our own particular religious loyalties, but we shall deepen them in dialogue ^{and concourse} with other religions in order to find those deeper roots in each religion which affirm the unity of global humanity and which affirm the transcendent love in which we all live and move and have our being.

As I humbly inaugurate this opening of the centenary celebrations, let us also move to common prayer, that all humanity may be brought into a single concourse and all of us acknowledge together in our various idioms the Transcendent Love, Wisdom and Power that really unites us.

GLOBAL MILITARY EXPENDITURE- AN AFFRONT TO HUMANITY

(Paul Gregorios, India)

According to the SIPRI Yearbook(86), the global military expenditure in 1985 was, at 1980 prices and exchange rates, U.S.\$ 663.12 billion. Of this amount 53.1% was spent by Industrial Market Economy countries, 29.6% by Non-market economies, 8.2% by Oil-exporting countries, 5.2% by other countries with a per capita national income of \$ 1640 and above, 2.1% by countries in the \$440-\$1639 range, and 1.7% by countries with a national per capita income of less than \$ 440 per annum.

Total NATO expenditure in 1985 was \$ 327.68 billion, compared to WTO's total of \$ 160.132. U.S.A. spent, in terms of 1980 prices, \$ 204.896 billion, and the USSR at the 1980 prices and exchange rates, \$ 146.2 billion.

The trends can be seen in the following table:

(Millions of US dollars at 1980 rates)

	1976	1980	1985
Total NATO	233,304	256,301	327,680
Total WTO	135,748	144,279	160,132
U S A	131,712	143,981	204,896
U S S R	124,200	131,800	146,200

While in 1976, NATO expenditure was 71.86% more than the WTO, by 1985 it was 104.63% above WTO. US military expenditure grew by 55.56% in the period, while USSR expenditure grew by 17.71%.

It is also noteworthy that while the rate of growth in annual military expenditure in Industrial Market Economy countries was only 1.5% in the period 1975-80, it shot up to 5% in the 1980-85 period. The US National Defence outlay went up from \$134 billion in FY 1980 to \$252.7 billion in FY 1985. The increase in total NATO military expenditure in 1985 over the previous year was a stunning 6.3% (compare WTO 3.1%). Most of this can be attributed to leaps in SDI expenditure. Even more astonishing is the fact that countries with lower than \$440 per capita annual income also increased their military expenditure by 4.3% from 1984 to 1985.

These are fairly dry statistics, which do not

move us very much. It is the reality behind these figures that should draw our attention. Three aspects of that reality need high-lighting.

I. AN AFFRONT TO HUMANITY

One cannot forget the obvious fact that all this senseless military expenditure takes place in a world where two thirds of its population are still striving to get the bare amenities to live a life worthy of a human being. Why should India which has the largest number of the world's poor still spend US\$ 6.182 billion on defence in 1985, and in 1987 make a fantastic jump of about 17% in its defence budget over the previous year? Why should Saudi Arabia, which in terms of population is a small country spend US\$ 21.429 billion in 1985? A newly independent country like Mozambique spent 11.7% of its GNP on defence in 1985. In the U S A for example while its GDP grew by about 9% in real terms between 1981 and 1985, its military expenditure grew by 33.15%.

Where is the sense in this military spending when two-thirds of humanity is crying out for bread and shelter? If current global military expenditure is estimated at ~~\$900~~ 950 billion at current prices, it seems obvious that 10% of that amount invested intelligently and equitably for the next ten years would wipe out poverty from our globe. Whoever can make that decision is not prepared to do so for reasons which are not quite so obvious. Of course, cutting military expenditure would not automatically release funds for development, for there would be other claimants for that revenue. There need be no doubt that drastic reductions in nuclear weapons and arresting their vertical proliferation alone can generate enormous amounts of funds in nuclear weapon states. But will these funds then become available for relieving poverty in the developing countries? It would be quite unrealistic to expect that. But why?

One reason is that those who make the decisions, especially in market economy countries, have vested interests in military power and in military expenditure.

There is ^{first} a theoretical problem in how people perceive the strength of a state. In the market economies the rulers seem to give a central place to military might and military actions as a show of their strength - witness India in Bangladesh, Britain in Malvinas and the USA in Grenada. Unfortunately it is not rulers alone who think in these terms. The people, most of them, join the rulers in this kind of assessment. The academics even provide theories to justify this kind of thinking. One such theory is that the "power" of a nation can be measured in terms of certain constant factors like geographical location, extent of territory, population, natural resources, the industrial potential, and the size of the GDP, and a consciously variable factor called military strength measured in terms of size of armed forces and arsenals and their technological up-to-dateness. The formula then would be:

where P stands for the measure of state power, a for the technological effectiveness factor of armed personnel and weapons, x for the quantum of forces and weapons, and H for the relatively unvarying factors mentioned above. It is this kind of thinking that makes rulers and people equally crazy about acquiring and keeping weapons and forces. Disarmament is impossible until this kind of thinking changes radically. In socialist countries that change is already taking place. In the New Thinking priority is given to economic productivity and cultural creativity, military strength being subordinate to these.

Military strength is also used to support domineering and oppressive structures, both nationally and internationally. Those who rely on military power to undergird their regimes give higher priority to the need of the regime to stay in power than to the needs of the people. That is one main reason why disarmament is not an attractive proposition to them. This wrong priority becomes thus a real affront to the people, except to those people who want to cling on to positions of undue power and privilege. (

II. COLOSSAL WASTE AND MISUSE OF HUMAN AND MATERIAL RESOURCES

How productive is all this military expenditure? Its advocates claim that it creates jobs and keeps the economy going, particularly in market economy countries. The second justifying argument is that it is the motor of technological and therefore of economic progress. Both arguments can be shown to be hollow. Conversion studies in many industrial market economy countries have clearly shown that the same investment in peaceful and creative economic activities can generate more jobs. The sums invested in military R & D alone have today become colossal. The same amounts invested in research on basic human needs like food, shelter, clothing, transportation, education, housing and health as well as cultural creativity, can certainly produce substantially more technological and socio-economic progress than the spin-offs from military R&D. Only the political will to make that transition is sadly lacking.

The waste and abuse factor in military expenditure has been only partially studied. In the U S A for example, the Pentagon's Inspector General J.H.Sherick disclosed, in 1985, that 45 of the 100 top defence contractors were under investigation for abuses including kickbacks, false claims, and questionable billing. General Electric was subsequently convicted of wrongly adding an additional \$ 800,000 in the bills for labour payments. Rockwell International, facing prosecution by the Justice Department, pleaded guilty to criminal charges of padding labour bills. Rockwell got away with a fine of \$ 1.5 million, but was temporarily barred from government contracts (See Washington Post, 30th August 1985, and 1st November 1985). On the 4th of December 1985, New York Times headlined a front page item:GENERAL

DYNAMICS SUSPENDED BY U S ON NEW CONTRACTS. On the 3rd December 1985 it also reported that a top NASA official was indicted for fraud on weapons costs. Congressional Research Service Report No. I.B. 85067 by R. O'Rourke entitled "Alleged Fraud, Waste and Abuse: General Dynamics Corporation" (U S Library of Congress, Washington DC, 12th July 1985) has shown how fraud and abuse are deeply entrenched in military expenditure. *These factors are present in India*

The relation between retired military officials and the armaments industry is indeed frightening. General Alexander Haig, once Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces in Europe and later U S Secretary of State (81-82) was President and Chief Operating Officer of United Technologies Corporation, a major defence contracting firm. Its Vice-President, General W Evans, was Commander-in-Chief of U S Air Force in Europe. N. Augustine, when he retired as Assistant Secretary of the Army became Vice-President of Martin Marietta Aerospace Corporation, another Defence Contract giant.

This phenomenon is not limited to the U S A. It has, however, been studied in greater detail there. How does General Dynamics get out of the hole when indicted? It is located in the state of Missouri, and the Senator from Missouri always helps, because the economy of the state is heavily dependent on General Dynamics. Californian firms like McDonnell Douglas, Northrop and Rockwell can get help from former President Nixon and from the present President, who was formerly Governor of California.

There are also Asians, Africans, and Latin Americans who are closely related to these transnational corporations and promote their business by interfering in the politics of Two-third World countries. The most notorious of these is the Arab adventurist and businessman Adnan Khashoggi, who is reported to have contributed anywhere from 1 to 10 million dollars (the sources differ on this) to finance the 1972 presidential campaign of Richard Nixon, the late ex-Shah of Iran being another munificent contributor to the same campaign.

Whose money are these war barons playing with? Where do these billions of military expenditure come from? Of course from the hard labour of those who pay taxes. What benefits do the people get from all this expenditure? Security, some answer. Some security! Ask any six year old in the western world, and he or she will tell you that one has little hope of growing up to be an adult, that the whole thing may blow up any time. That is the kind of deep insecurity that the arms build-up provides for humanity. Certainly there are other and more intelligent ways of finding security without all these weapons. One way of doing so is to build up a system of trusting each other. When the delegates from the U S A and the U S S R gather together in inter-national conferences or at the negotiating table, they do not talk to each other with guns drawn. They trust each other that the one will not shoot the other. Such trust can be built up between nations if we can grow into some kind of an

international morality and Common Security. That is the alternative to global military expenditure and the constant war-scare under which we all live and stunt the personalities of our children. If people do not want war and weapon stockpiles, who wants them then? That question must be asked and intelligently answered.

III THE PEACE MOVEMENT MUST BECOME THE NEW FREEDOM MOVEMENT

Who are the merchants of death who wax fat at the expense of the tax-payer and keep themselves in power behind many of our market economy states? There were such in the last century also. It was easy to understand a 19th century merchant of death like Krupp, because the pattern then was simple. For three generations they sold death-dealing weapons to European and other states, and profited from every war that broke out. They supplied Bismarck and Hitler, but also Austria whom Bismarck was fighting. In 1866 Prussians and Austrians killed each other with the same Krupp guns. Today governments support the arms manufacturers and traders, since these governments are run by political parties dependent on the industrialists and the traders.

Today the same nations and their merchants of death arm Iraq and Iran, Israel and Saudi Arabia, the white Apartheid regime in South Africa and many of the Black Frontline states of Southern Africa. Start a war in Korea or Vietnam, the profits of Douglas, Lockheed and Boeing shoot up. 65% of the over-all receipts of the Aerospace industry in the U S A, 67% in Britain and 82% in the Federal Republic of Germany in the late 70's came from military sales (Transnational Corporations, Armaments and Development, Tampere Peace Research Institute, Research Report No. 22, 1980, p.41). In 1978, 70% of France's aviation industry output was exported, of which 72% was for military purposes. Peace and Common Security spell a nightmare for these industries. They employ millions of people, have thousands of smaller subsidiaries and sub-contractors, and finance political parties in many countries. The roots of global military expenditure spread wide and deep into all sectors of the market economy system.

These giant corporations of the Industrial market economies are linked, under technical and investment collaboration arrangements, with similar corporations in the Two-third World countries, where the same pattern of domination and exploitation is repeated. Israel, for example, exports more than half of its military exports to Latin American dictatorships and to South Africa. Several Asian and Latin American countries are now getting into the arms manufacture and export business.

This is the pattern of neo-colonialism that has developed in the world since 1945, and it is this system that is the real issue behind the global military expenditure. It is the same system that uses the taxpayers money to buttress reactionary regimes in many countries, makes small nations fight each

other, and upholds the capitalist system and its markets in the world by making nations buy unnecessary weapons. The same system puts pressure on socialist countries, through its avowed intention to overthrow socialist governments, to spend more money on armaments than they would otherwise have, and thus slows down the rise in the standard of living in socialist countries. It is this system that opposes disarmament and frowns upon peace movements.

The central issue of Disarmament and Development then is not a question of reducing global military expenditure by a certain percentage and then deploying it for global development. Global military expenditure is but the iron fist of neo-colonialism. Peace movements in the world have to learn to tackle the system itself and not just the fist. That is why the issue of peace is inseparable from the issue of justice in the world. That is why a peace movement that wants to be realistic has to be a liberation movement - liberation from the shackles of the world-wide neo-colonial system.

The liberation movement coming from Latin America, however, has so far shown but scant interest in the Peace Movement. They try to separate Peace and Justice and try to give priority to Justice. This path too is likely to find itself at a dead end. For the issues of Peace, Justice, and the human environment are integrally related to each other. The Peace Movement should now become a New Liberation Movement dedicated to the three concerns - for just, free and creative societies, for peace, disarmament and Common Security, and for a way of life that conserves and cares for the natural environment rather than plundering, pillaging and destroying it, through mindless abuse or by precipitating nuclear catastrophe.

Let me conclude by expressing the hope that the preparations and agenda for the forthcoming U N Conference on Development and Disarmament will pay adequate attention to the inter-link between neo-colonialism and the growing global military expenditure.

LOOKING AHEAD

WITHOUT TAKING YOUR EYES OFF YOUR TOES

(Paulos Mar Gregorios, India)

Please do not walk ahead. There are several ditches right in front of you. You may look ahead across the ditches; but if you want to move ahead to what you see, you better first find effective strategies to cross those ditches. Otherwise you will just end up in a ditch. That certainly was not your intention in trying to look ahead. The Third Millennium of our era stands across those ditches and beckons. I would here simply like to identify three of these ditches. I have no strategy to propose for crossing them.

National-Ethnic Identity

The modern nation-state is hardly four centuries old, if the Peace of Westphalia(1648) is to be taken as its date of birth. In every nation the state or the establishment teaches its citizens that the interests of people born in or immigrating into a given geographical territory or nation-state are to be given special preference over the interests of people elsewhere. The nation-state thus becomes a sort of property-holding group, ready to go to war to protect or advance its interests which are often inimical to the interests of humanity or of other nations. They will go to war, erect tariff walls, engage in destabilisation tactics

abroad, overlook injustice in friendly nations and castigate unfriendly nations who practice the same or other kind of injustice, all to defend the so-called interests of its citizens.

How come that the victim of a flood in Dallas gets a disproportionately larger amount of assistance from the state in relation to what a similar victim of floods in Bangladesh can get, despite the fact that the latter's loss is worthy of more compassion because of greater helplessness? How come that a ceramic worker in China gets a much lower reward for his labours which have produced something of greater value, than a German labourer producing weapons of destruction in an armaments factory in Germany? The nation-state as a bestower of privilege to the people within its territorial boundaries seems to me an idea whose time is gone.

Crossing that ditch of national sovereignty seems quite arduous. But national sovereignty is a lie, a hangover from the days of imperialism. No nation is in fact sovereign, though some nations like to act as if its interests were sovereign. The lie should be exposed and dissipated. It is time that we developed and promoted a new idea that goes far beyond that of national sovereignty. That new idea is "responsible global community of nations". In this concept, no nation can be sovereign: every nation is member of a global community and responsible to it, and through it to humanity as a whole. The very idea of sovereignty is obsolete, because it is the antithesis of freedom, community and responsibility. Not even humanity as a whole can be

plants and to the life-promoting environment; it is responsible also to that Source from which it derives its very existence, and by Which alone it can exist. Sovereignty is a false concept. Even God does not exercise it.

What is strange today is that people are forsaking their national identities only to resort to much narrower identities like ethnic, religious or tribal. Yugoslavia and the U S S R are prime examples of the break-up of the larger national identity. There is an important lesson to be learned here. On the one hand we must move beyond national identities; on the other hand, we need sufficiently manageable smaller identities; being just a member of a common humanity somehow does not satisfy the need for the security of one's identity. Each human being has several identities: family, ethnos or race, gender, language, territory, profession, nationality and so on. These need not be abolished; they all need to be brought into one single open, creative, integrative, non-exclusive identity. This is what we call a responsible, global human community of nations. Within this larger framework, every smaller identity can be conserved, so long as it is open and non-exclusive, and be made creative and productive for the whole. So, in crossing the ditch of national sovereignty, we do not abolish national or even narrower identities; we simply put them in touch with a dynamic global human identity.

Secular Civilisation and Its Institutions

public life for granted. We need first to have some grasp of how the idea of the secular landed on our laps. It is, in the form in which most nations use it today, a European creation. In the seventeenth century when Europe began to be confronted with the need for accepting and living with religious diversity, which in fact amounted only to a Protestant-Catholic duality, the European state took the secular road, primarily as a reaction. What was established at the Treaty of Westphalia (terminating Europe's major internal religious war between Catholic and Protestant states from 1618-1648) was the principle of a mono-religious state, replacing that of a mono-religious Europe, which the decaying Holy Roman Empire could no longer sustain. Cuius regio eius religio, in fact means that every citizen is under legal obligation to follow the religion of the King, and also to change one's religious affiliation every time the King changes his. The principle, basically unjust, undemocratic and undignified as it was, failed to work even after the Thirty Years War had ended. Europe fell into religious, moral and economic as well as political chaos and anarchy after the principle was established. It is interesting that the Treaty of Westphalia of 1648, which established the opposite of the principle of the secular state, was among the first to use the word 'secularisation' in history - denoting by that term confiscation of church property and making it public property.

The notion of the 'secular state' is a specific creation of the European Enlightenment of the 18th and 19th centuries, in repudiation of both the mono-religious

state religion) principle which replaced it in 1648. In order to solve the problem of Roman Catholic states and Protestant states fighting each other, the new principle of the 'secular state' was established, by which religion was no longer to be connected with the state at all and therefore supposedly not a ground of conflict among them.

The so-called separation of Church and State was first proposed as a way for enabling warring European states to live together in peace. The 'secular state' has not, however, in actual fact, been able to conserve the peace in Europe. Before the establishment of the secular state, religion only **seemed** to be what the European states were fighting each other about. The real causus belli was conflict of economic interests, and religion was only a mask. That is why the secular state has not been able to put an end to war.

But the principle of the secular state has done something enormously significant to humanity's religious consciousness. It is this impact that we should now begin to assess at the end of the second millennium, in order to find a principle for the state which goes beyond that of the 'secular state'. We can here give only some pointers for such an assessment of what the secular state has done to the consciousness of humanity.

First by driving out religion from political institutions, from schools, colleges and academies as well as from hospitals, and from the public media, we have managed *to give, not only to our children, but to our own selves as*

they not teach it in the school?". It is a curious fact that while 80 percent of the world's people today adhere to one religion or another, and it plays such an important part in their lives, both consciously and unconsciously, the ideology that rules in our public institutions is that of the 20 percent who profess no religion. This marginalisation of religious faith and the domination of the secular ideology in our public life has radically distorted religion itself.

Driven out from public life, religion, which is naturally corporate and communitarian, becomes a matter of individual preference for which the individual is solely responsible. This privatises and individualises religion and deprives society of access to its benefits except through individuals and their personal contributions.

We need today a kind of state which neither prescribes the religion I should pursue, nor drives it out from the public realm altogether. This is possible only when the state itself assumes some responsibility to promote the more open and humanitarian aspects of all religions and discourages their antihuman and sectarian political uses. The state is not to control religion, but actively to promote the more humanitarian elements in all religions. Religion should thus be given an opportunity to be a positive factor in public life rather than being excluded from it. Without religion, of course with some necessary refinements, becoming central to public life, we can have little hope of breaking free from this secular stranglehold on our public life. Reli-

need a new and refined matrix produced by all the religions and the secular ideology in a community of dialogue with each other and in common search for the creation of a new civilisation. Out of such a matrix and not out of the secular culture alone can emerge the basic elements for a new, more free, more creative and more human civilisation on earth.

Liberating Science/Technology

Science/Technology, that inseparable pair, is the hallmark of the civilisation in which we now live. Without the conditions created by secular civilisation, science/technology could not have triumphed the way it has. But without that sci/tech this civilisation of ours could not have achieved what it has. The secular civilisation and science/technology reinforce each other and seem to be symbiotic.

The third ditch we have to cross on our way ahead would be the one where we find science/technology a prisoner of war and profit. Sci/tech can resolve many of the problems facing humanity, like malnutrition, poverty, lack of housing and health care, illiteracy, floods and famines, epidemics and so on. But this can happen only when the control of science/technology passes over from the defence establishments, from arms traders and from corporations out to make the quick buck.

Science/Technology today is no abstract

its own power elites and has a lobby power equal to that of the Church in medieval Europe. One can seldom manage to challenge its authority and get away with it. With all the power at its disposal, however, it is not able to solve the problems of humanity. To do that it must be liberated from the control of its present masters and brought under the responsible control of a responsible public (not the politicians, God forbid!). Only a vigilant and informed public can set that liberation process in motion. We better find a strategy to do that before the Third Millennium dawns.

** ** ** ** ** **

There certainly are many more ditches, some offering considerable resistance. The determination with which we face the three we have mentioned will need to be applied to these other ditches as well. The important thing is to start.

1 These Days of Mortal Peril

The danger is that if you just bring together a few politicians and a few religious leaders, they will say some nice things, and you will say some nice things, and you will agree—and then you will go home.

METROPOLITAN PAULO MAR GREGORIOS

“WHY did they put that snap up there?”

The question came from an Indian professor of philosophy sitting next to me. He was looking up at a photograph of the Earth taken from space, a thirty-foot enlargement that had been rigged up high above the platform. Throughout the week this portrait of the Earth floated above us, serene and beautiful. Clearly, the organizers of the Oxford Global Survival Conference hoped the image of the Earth would remind us, without a word, of the peace and wholeness we were longing for.

My neighbor understood the intention of the organizers very well. But I knew why he objected. The technological expertise that allowed the photograph to be taken in space and transported to us here with such apparent ease and confidence should not mislead us into thinking that some technological wizardry would solve the problems of global survival. However serene the portrait of the Earth might look from space, achieving that serenity on terra firma was not going to be a simple matter.

Indeed, from late Monday afternoon, when the conference opened, speaker after speaker drew attention to the huge and multiplying problems in the world. A waterfall of catastrophes tumbled from the platform: acid rain, deforestation, the tear in the ozone layer, nuclear war, the debt crisis, terrorism, famine . . . In addition to these external dangers, we heard about internal threats

Earth Conference One

to the human psyche: materialism, marital violence, pornography, drug abuse, teenage alienation. The world was being torn apart outside and in.

If a patient had this many disorders, a doctor would despair about where to begin. It was the same for us. What should our priorities be? Should we focus on political problems, spiritual starvation, environmental pollution? Adding to our pressure was the knowledge that we had to move fast. Each of the Earth's illnesses was serious enough to put her on the emergency list. Whichever disorder we focused on, another could erupt and kill her.

Some of the spiritual and temporal leaders at the conference identified the threat of nuclear war as the Earth's most pressing disorder. His Eminence Cardinal Franz Koenig of Vienna reminded us in the opening meditation on Monday afternoon that "more than fifty thousand atom bombs are stored in the world's arsenals, enough to destroy the world fifty times over." Japan's then-prime minister Takeo Fukuda sent a message to the conference in which he said that, of all his many worries about the future of the planet, the nuclear threat was uppermost. "While some moves are seen in both blocs to eradicate the idiocy of nuclear arms expansion, it is still in the initial stage," he said. "There is still no guarantee that these nuclear weapons will not be used. I shudder at the thought." The American astronomer, Carl Sagan, offered a dramatic metaphor to illustrate the danger of nuclear escalation: "The confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union reminds me of two implacable enemies who have locked themselves into a room that is awash in gasoline. One of them has, let us say, twelve thousand wooden matches in his pockets, and the other nearly 11,500. They are each desperately engaged in procuring more matches—to make them 'safe.' " Sagan's Russian counterpart at the conference, Evguenij Velikhov, vice president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, was equally worried: he devoted his address almost entirely to the nuclear issue.

The nuclear threat did not, however, have absolute priority at the conference. There was a rival concern: the ecological breakdown of the biosphere. James Parks Morton, dean of the Church of St. John the Divine in New York City and one of the conference's organizers, emphasized the threat to the ozone layer and the rain

These Days of Mortal Peril

forests in his talk, while making it clear that these were only symptoms of a planet under threat. It was "the whole business: the biosphere, the entire planet in danger" that concerned him. Even if we didn't blow ourselves up, many of the conference delegates pointed out, the continuing degradation of the Earth would lead to annihilation.

If the ozone layer continued to tear, for example, that would be enough to erase humanity through death by cancer and by starvation. Dr. Sagan explained exactly how the process would take place. Mars, he said, unlike the Earth, has no sunscreen, so

the surface layer of Mars is fried by ultraviolet light from the Sun. [But] high up in the atmosphere, twenty-five kilometers or so, where the air is very thin, the Earth has a fine layer of ozone. Were the entire ozone layer brought down into this room, at the pressure and temperature of this room, it would be one quarter of a millimeter thick. It is a very thin and fragile screen, a very delicate protection against ultraviolet light from the Sun.

Through the development of a seemingly benign chemical, the chlorofluorocarbons, the protective ozone layer is now thinning. These chlorofluorocarbons were developed as refrigerants, as propellants in aerosol spray cans, in the development of plastic foams. Their great virtue was that they were chemically unreactive, so that they could do, it was thought, no harm. But ozone is so reactive that the chlorofluorocarbons simply accumulate until they find themselves high in the atmosphere, where they chemically combine with the ozone, removing it and letting the ultraviolet light in.

The net result of an increase in ultraviolet light at the surface of the Earth has been discussed, but in my view not on the proper grounds. It's been discussed as dangerous because it will cause an increase in skin cancer. Well, it will cause an increase in skin cancer especially in light-skinned people. Dark-skinned people are so very nicely protected by melanin that they do not have as much to worry about. There is a kind of cosmic

justice in this: the light-skinned people develop the chlorofluorocarbons, which then preferentially give skin cancer to light-skinned people; the dark-skinned people who had nothing to do with the invention are protected.

However, there is not much cosmic justice along these lines because, as Sagan went on to say,

The principal dangers are not skin cancer. The big danger is that we are at the top of some great ecological pyramid, some vast food chain; and at the base of that food chain are microbes that are vulnerable to increase in ultraviolet light.

It's clearest in the oceanic ecosystem: at the very top of the ocean there are small light-harvesting microorganisms called phyton plankton, one-celled plants. They don't have much in the way of resources. They process light into food and they are then eaten by little one-celled animals, called zoo plankton. They in turn are eaten by little invertebrates including krill, a kind of shrimp, and they in turn are eaten by little fish; little fish are eaten by bigger fish. The bigger fish are eaten by dolphins, who are eaten by nobody except ultraviolet radiation. Something similar, although we are more ignorant about the food chains on land, is likely to be the case on land.

Nuclear war, environmental breakdown leading to cancer and starvation: that seemed to be enough for the conference to deal with, but there was more. The international financial system, we heard, was precariously poised. It could collapse at any moment. Money—that commodity whose chief characteristic in ordinary times seemed to be its reassuring solidity, its frustrating but ultimately comforting finiteness—could go crazy, crazier than in the Great Depression of the 1930s, and inflate into meaninglessness before shrivelling like an untied balloon. Money is now the hard language of the international business world; words are pliable and can be twisted, but putting your money where your mouth is reassures everyone that you mean what you say. If money were to keep changing its meaning, the rules of economic and political dealing would founder.

Who would suffer the most? The poor, of course, for whom the value of **each** penny is sacrosanct. In their budgets, they have no margin for inflationary flux. Professor Mawupe Vovor, former president of the National Assembly of Togo, was worried about the effect of financial instability on developing countries, which would not be able to **cope** with a further devaluation of their incomes. He warned of "**dangerous** stagnation and even a regression in Third World development, increasing the international debt of the poorest of countries."

Prime Minister Fukuda added his fears: "Since the first oil crisis of fourteen years ago, the old order of the world economy collapsed and the new path is yet to be established. Starting with the United States, all countries are confronted with major difficulties. In particular, the developing world is suffering from protracted economic stagnation and the most grave external debt problem. No one can be certain that none of these debtor countries will bankrupt. The economic uncertainties in each of these countries will trigger social and political chaos."

In case we should forget what financial distress already means to poor people, James Grant of UNICEF, in a speech read out by his deputy, Marco Vianello-Chiodo, told us that "thirty-eight thousand children die each day, and a comparable number are crippled for life—the vast majority from causes for which we have long since discovered low-cost cures or preventions." If the remedies are already known and they are so cheap, why do the children die? Because their families are too poor to afford even these five-cent remedies, or they live in countries too poor to distribute them where they are most needed. As a result of this poverty, Jim Grant informed us, a child dies unnecessarily every two seconds. If poverty deepened further, how many more children would be crippled by disease and malnutrition, or die lingering deaths? The developing world is already spending a quarter of its export revenues repaying the interest on its debts to the industrialized world, cutting back on family health and welfare budgets in order to meet these payments. If inflation were to rise further and the interest repayments to rise, even more children would die.

We were reminded by yet another participant that 20 percent of humanity—a billion people—suffer daily hunger despite the enormous wealth that exists in the world. Most of us at the

conference are shielded from the experience of such poverty. How could we become sensitized to the reality that so many of our fellow human beings experience every day, since that sensitization must be the first step in motivating us to change an obscene inequality? One of the observers at the conference, Masatoshi Kohno, a Rissho Kosei-kai Buddhist, told me that he, in common with the other 6.5 million members of this Buddhist lay organization, practised voluntary fasting. Three days a month, every month, they skipped a meal and contributed the cost of these meals to helping the poor—for example, by buying trees to be planted in Nepal, to counter soil erosion. Even more important than the financial contribution was the sense of solidarity with the hungry that it awakened in the well-fed: "As you see," he said, pointing to his thin frame, "I'm very skinny. If I just skip breakfast, I am feeling dizzy by lunchtime. It is a way to be symbolically with the people who are hungry all the time."

I thought of the times I have fasted, and how difficult I have found it. I could hardly bear to think beyond the minor discomfort of missing a meal or two to the pain of real hunger. With a shock I remembered an incident in Sri Lanka when I was about eight or nine years old. I heard a man shouting in the road outside our house. I ran to the window and saw the man, bones protruding, staggering from one side of the road to the other and crying out in a voice too desperate for pride, "Hungry! Hungry!" I edged towards him, terrified, and saw him collapse, writhing in pain on the tarmac.

There are a billion people hungry like this, every day; a thousand million innocent human beings, guilty of no crime but poverty. And as the environment deteriorates, there will be less food available to feed the world's people, not more. So what was the conference going to focus on—nuclear war, the ozone problem, debt, or hunger?

Several of the participants added population growth as a major problem, while still others referred to terrorism, violence in general, or the widespread alienation that led people to blot out the miseries they saw with escapist addictions like drink or drugs or by bombarding their senses with electronic flak.

A vast array of issues had been set before the conference. By the time the opening session ended on Monday evening, we were

left with a picture of a planet falling apart before our horrified eyes. Nor was there any hiding place; no country was safe from danger. Even if the government of the country we lived in were determined to take good care of its people and its environment, the carelessness of other countries would damage us. Leaflets available at the conference told us about Scandinavian lakes and forests, for example, being damaged by acid rain from Britain; it was estimated that eighteen thousand Scandinavian lakes are dead or dying as a direct result of acid rains. Our life support systems were fragmenting all around us as we watched—and the longer we stood staring, the faster we saw the rate of fragmentation accelerating. Professor Vovor summed up the times we live in as “these days of mortal peril and infinite disorder.”

Human beings have always been faced with mortal danger, of course: people in the Bronze Age or the Middle Ages knew catastrophe. But in those days, although catastrophe came to the group we lived in, or to ourselves and a clutch of neighboring groups beyond the hill, or on the other side of the river, or even on the other side of the ocean, humanity would continue to thrive. What we are now facing is a full-scale and imminent wiping out of our entire human race—and much of the biosphere along with us.

By the end of the first day, the conference hall was filled with a sense of urgency. An Oxford undergraduate, who was helping the conference organisers as a volunteer, said, “I had heard of these problems before, but I’d never registered them. Hearing them repeated over and over like this by forceful speakers makes you really take them in.” In a paper called “The Secrets of Successful Grassroots Action,” the key to success was described as passing on “compelling information.” The information we heard at the conference, some which we had heard and half taken in before, suddenly did seem compelling—perhaps because the conference had put together so many aspects of a planet in trouble. Any one of these problems we might feel able to put aside to consider another day, but how can you put aside a deluge? After what we had heard, we could no longer retreat comfortably into the manageable problems of our everyday lives, with our attention to global survival shrunken to a flickering glance at a news item.

This raising of the participants’ consciousness was a powerful act in itself, at a time when governments and news media were

Earth Conference One

still placing their attention elsewhere. It was clear by the end of the first evening of the conference that we had to act urgently to save our planet. The question we faced was no longer Should we act, but How? We needed only to know where to begin.

Like others at the conference, I felt a desperate need for some port in this stormy sea where I could stop and take stock of what was happening, find some sense of direction through this chaos. Dr. Robert Runcie, the Archbishop of Canterbury, put his finger on the need many of us felt when he said we were “confronted by a search for meaning in the human enterprise.”

That was exactly the point. To get successfully through any crisis, any period of suffering, we need to perceive its nature and meaning. A woman who feels repeatedly dizzy and sick will naturally be anxious about her health—until she realizes she is pregnant. That new meaning, that change of perception alters everything: her attitude toward her symptoms and the way she deals with them. In the same way, we needed to see the meaning in the changes that were taking place on the planet.

Were we living in a world that was breaking down haphazardly—or was there some underlying meaning in all these symptoms of breakdown? Perhaps the world was pregnant with a new and worthwhile future—something worth the suffering of this painful childbirth. Or were we merely seeing the signs of irreversible decay? Even if the process were only negative, we still needed to know its meaning in order to halt the downward slide.

From the platform came calls for unity, which demonstrated the longing for a single conceptual “bag” to contain all the jangling problems that had been presented to us. Were these problems really disparate or were they somehow connected? That was the key question. Were they symptoms of a deeper malaise—like a person with AIDS who has thereby lost his immunity to secondary infections? If so, we needed not only to keep the secondary infections from overwhelming the patient, but urgently to make a more searching diagnosis of the primary illness.

As a therapist, I was accustomed to stepping back to find meaning. A patient would often appear buzzing with a mass of problems—most of which were indications of a deeper, unconscious problem. It was my task to see, together with the patient, the underlying situation that was trying to show itself through the

These Days of Mortal Peril

symptoms. To cure a symptom prematurely would be to erase a clue.

An African delegate who looked uncomfortable during a long and detailed group debate about the nuts and bolts of nuclear disarmament made the point firmly: "Discussing the disarmament issue is not all we need for peace and survival," he said. "We need to deepen our diagnosis."

A conference called specifically to discuss disarmament, or saving the ozone layer, could discuss how best to solve that single issue—and if they managed it, everyone could go home satisfied. But at the Oxford Conference, global survival was our brief. Nothing short of that would do. So it seemed that we, too, had to be like a therapist: to look at the spate of disasters as symptoms of breakdown—and get from them a sense of the underlying problem. We needed not so much to cure the individual symptoms as to ask ourselves why they had appeared—why these particular problems? Why now? How were they linked? Nothing short of finding the meaning behind this multiple crisis would do, even if we failed in the attempt. So meaning, rather than piecemeal solutions, was what we were here to find: a shift in perception.

The very multiplicity of the problems we had been presented with that first afternoon had shown us that, since we were facing a hydra-headed monster, cutting off one head wouldn't make enough difference to save humanity. Too many other heads would still be there, slaving over us. While we heroically killed the torn-ozone head, the debt-crisis maw would be opening wide behind us. And even if we swung round expertly to deal that a blow, the nuclear warfare head would almost certainly get us. If we stayed focused on disarmament, millions of fellow humans would go on dying a slow and agonized death from hunger and disease.

It dawned on me for the first time that the principle of wholeness might be what the myth of the hydra was there to express. Until the conference I had never thought of its meaning, just dimly remembered it as a blood-and-guts fighting story. But the experience of the conference on that first day had brought home the pointlessness of getting attached to solving one fragment of a problem as though it were unconnected to a larger whole. And that was also why we had needed to come together from all over the world to look at global survival. It wasn't enough for just

Earth Conference One

some of us to look at some parts of the problems of survival—we were there together as representatives from the whole world to enlarge the context of our looking, to perceive a large enough meaning to encompass the whole planet.

And then I remembered that the myth had gone on to give us a further warning: cutting off a head, without understanding that we must burn it off at the root, resulted in the growth of two heads. In our haste and anxiety for practical results, we might be tempted to rejoice when someone cuts off a hydra head: but this hero would in fact have doubled the danger. It was time to stop waving our swords short-sightedly at one head or another, making matters worse by our superficial, isolated solutions; the conference had reminded us that we needed to pause—and find the heart of the hydra.

"Emerging Consciousness for a New Humankind"

(PAULOS GREGORIOS)

If history is documented memory, then the history of the human consciousness is very short indeed. Fortunately, memory is more than history, and the human consciousness has a longer memory than its documented history.

My desire in this paper is to trace the outlines of the development of human consciousness, in order that we may gain some understanding of where it is going in the near future. And in order to trace that development, I have often to step outside the limits of our documented history. Academic scholarship, which itself is part of that developed consciousness and whose competence to judge such matters needs often to be questioned, should bear with me, if all I say cannot be documented.

The human consciousness has a beginning which remains elusive to our methods of investigation. Where was the first human consciousness? Was it only in one place, or did it emerge in a dozen different areas? And if the first human (African) couples had parents, as they ~~are~~ no doubt must have had, who were those parents, and how and in what way were the children different from their parents? How could the children be human and the parents animal or sub-human?

This problem of the difficulty of tracing the line of demarcation (between human and animal) will occur elsewhere, for example between vegetable and animal, or between inorganic and organic. From the beginning we should be prepared to examine the thesis that consciousness has no boundaries and is perhaps a single unit with many modes. That thesis, as old as consciousness in humanity, we shall not examine in detail in this paper.

So it seems that the emergence of human consciousness as distinct from animal consciousness is historically and even conceptually untraceable. And the infancy of that human consciousness also remains untraceable. Scientists tell us to-day that humanity of our kind has been around on our planet for more than 600,000 years, but that is a rough estimate, a good guess based on available evidence, one that may have to be substantially revised later on, in the light of new evidence.

It is not surprising that most of the history of the human race is pre-historic in the sense that the fully documented history hardly goes back 6000 years-not even 1% of humanity's existence on earth? What is the significance of the fact that the human consciousness cannot document 99% of its historical development? For me one thing is clear. We know so little, with our conscious minds, of the true nature of our consciousness. What Biology, Psychology and other modern disciplines can tell us about human mind and its evolution cannot even give us a clue to its real nature. For that clue we may have to trust the deeper reaches of our consciousness.

CONSCIOUSNESS IN HISTORY

As consciousness emerges into remembered and documented history about 6000 years ago, it is a universal phenomenon with many common characteristics, but also with local peculiarities-reflected in differences of language, culture, myth, and ritual. But the common characteristics of this universal human consciousness as it emerges into historical view are striking. From Father Smith to Mircea Eliade there have been many attempts to trace the main elements of this "Primal Vision" through the

study of 'primitive' cultures. Our kind of rationality is certainly not one of those characteristics. Neither is the modern confidence that an individual mind can grasp reality through rational thinking.

What was there was an unverballed awareness that one's mind and body were part of a whole which included not only other living human persons, but also earth and sun, river and mountain, plants and animals, the tribal ancestors and many "mythical" beings. One lived this unity with the whole through dance and song, myth and ritual, rather than talk or write about it. Talking and writing may be important for us children of the European Enlightenment, with our pronounced individualism and exaggerated confidence about language and proposition. But we will never experience that fundamental unity through talking and writing. It has to be experienced sensed, lived, even today even for us children of the European Enlightenment.

The second aspect of this Primal Vision was the awareness that there was more than what met the eye and the ear. This little corner of the universe where we run about and play is only that - a little corner which by no means openly reveals the nature of the whole. That nature has to be sought first through our sense-perception, through language and myth, worship and ritual, then beyond these through a disciplined search, to a realisation, which cannot be expressed in words.

The Primal Vision was universal and is still universal. It is not only in the "primitive" tribes that it survives, It lives today in the suppressed layers of the consciousness of us children of the European Enlightenment. And my strong thesis today is that we must reactivate this layer of our consciousness, if we need to recover wholeness and healing. Both aspects of the primal vision are important-the unverballed, ritually experienced awareness of wholeness, and the disciplined search for the hidden meaning of the whole.

2. The Emergence of Verbalized Consciousness

This second stage (always speaking of the later 1% of time of conscious human existence) was also universal. Language became rich and diversified but was always supplemented by ritual music and dance to express the deeper dimensions of human experience and perception. With language, the self emerges as subject distinguished from object. The self as it emerges in prehistory is not totally alienated from the social, biological and inorganic environment. In fact, on the contrary the higher quest in all East Asian religions is to experience and realise the unity and oneness of the personal self with the cosmic self. This is the witness of two of the oldest spiritual traditions-the Indian and the Chinese.

And culture arises in this context-of relating the personal self to the social self and to the cosmic self. At this stage the "world is not an object for the subjective self to "explore" and "manipulate". The world, like the body, is where you are-the matrix and manifestation of the self. It is only after the European Enlightenment the people begin to think systematically of the Person as subject and the world as object.

The development of language brings about new possibilities of cultural development. Language as it develops is largely spoken very little written. Alas, this leaves us today in the dark, or at least very much in the dark, about what our pre-historic ancestor thought and said. Spoken language was one new symbolic expression of man's emerging consciousness. Written language is only a symbolic expression of what is itself a symbolic expression, namely spoken language.

As often language developed, along with greater elaboration in cult and ritual, the human consciousness rose to a new level. But this level was not without distortions. As verbal enrichment and conceptual clarity emerged, the possibilities of false perception also increased. The new perceptions were themselves the result of the added facility of clear conceptual language. There was more prose than poetry. Words in the previous language were evocative rather than descriptive, activity in the right hemisphere of the brain decreased often, as the left hemisphere developed; philosophy, mathematics and the rudiments of science developed, but all o language which directed ritual and morality with greater precision and clarity. The Sutra for meditation gives place to the sloka for disquisition, description and prescription. As greater manipulation of the external world became possible through language (descriptive and prescriptive) the inner world becomes turbulent with impingements from that external world. Where there was experience of inner harmony with the external world from which humanity was emerging, now there was the new struggle that of adaptation to the external world, and the effort to manipulate that world to suit ones needs. As agriculture and rudimentary technology developed and became more sophisticated, thenew environmental transactions began demanding new adjustments in the body and in the brain functions. Evolution became more rapid not bodily adaptation so much as mental development. The drastic acceleration in evolution takes place in the form of culture, which included ritual and morality, but also new methods of cultivation, hunting and housing - leading to what we call civilisation with the accent on the civitas or urban development.

But this civilisation was far from "secular" in our sense of the term. It was deeply pervaded by 'religious' perceptions mythically or ritually expressed. The dealing with the immediate environment through gathering knowledge about it, and manipulating it in accordance with that knowledge are material processes, but always within a matrix of spiritual and religious presupposition about oneself, other selves, the external world and the God or gods involved in every natural phenomenon and process. Language, written or spoken, becomes the major instrument of consciousness, but by no means its only instrument. Myth and ritual always undergird and even shape language.

3. Intrinsic Evolution and Extrinsic Evolution

In order to understand the nature of the problems facing the human consciousness today and the possibilities before it, we need to study the dialectic between intrinsic evolution and extrinsic evolution in the human species.

One way of grappling with this problem is to use the conceptual tools developed by Edward T. Hall, the author of The Silent Language (1959), The Hidden Dimension (1966) and Beyond Culture (Doubleday Anchor 1976). His basic concept is ET - not Extra-Terrestrial, but Extension Transference. Simply put, it goes like this, Human societies create externalisations of processes, e.g. instead of cutting meat with your teeth, you do it with a knife, instead of speaking, you write: instead of walking, you roll in a two-wheeled or four-wheeled carriage with or without a mechanical motor.

As these externalisations of internal body/mental processes develop they can be separated from humanity and reified or "thingified". Among the examples cited, the knife, the pen and the motor car are things which can be made by others and of agriculture. All things including food drink, clothing and artefacts become commodities. Air and water alone are largely exempted because in abundant and uncontrolled supply.

One of the greatest crises in the development of consciousness has come about in the period of "universal affluence" and "consumption explosion". As affluence comes within reach, and the commodities become available without visible limit, there is a tremendous pull on consciousness towards the means and manifestations of affluence, reified and external to consciousness.

This pull becomes universal, and children brought up within such a culture are unable to resist it. As consciousness becomes forcibly attached to commodities and things the other capacity of consciousness, to be at one with itself is turbulently ruffled.

The mind is thus a battleground - the extrinsic evolution affecting the intrinsic evolution of consciousness. As knowledge develops through extrinsic evolution of consciousness in its capacity to know things-to know how they work (science) and to know how to work on them (technology), there is a concomitant development of intrinsic ignorance. Extrinsic evolution is by "separative" knowledge, while there is a corresponding devolution in the intrinsic aspect of consciousness and its capacity for "integrative" knowledge of the whole and the self. As the objective and physical order becomes better known and so more "real" the inner realm and spiritual realities become less perceptible less held in awareness. Growth in "knowledge" of the external world thus becomes correlated to an increase in "ignorance" of the world of the whole and the self.

Sri Aurobindo analyses this ignorance in terms of a seven fold self-ignorance,

- a) Original ignorance - Ignorant of the Absolute, the one from whom the many of our knowledge originates;
- b) Cosmic ignorance. oblivion of the timeless and immutable self-in the midst of our knowledge of the many selves which are in time and change and which we take to be the only truth.
- c) Egoistic ignorance - ignorant of our self which is in union with the cosmic self: knowing of the Ego, the Id and the Super Ego, we presume that the "I" is the most important centre of existence.
- d) Temporal ignorance: So aware of our little span of time and change, we become ignorant of our own eternal being in time.
- e) Psychological ignorance: Taking the little layer of our conscious mind to be the whole of our minds, we become ignorant of what Aurobindo calls the Superconscient, sub-conscient, intra-conscient and circum-conscient, dimensions of our psyche.
- f) Constitutional ignorance: Thinking that we are constituted by life and body and mind we become ignorant of the supreme and mysterious constitutive principle in us.
- g) Practical ignorance: Caught in a maze of sensations, thoughts, actions, willings, responses and so on wandering among errors and desires, strivings and failures, we become more and more practically ignorant about what life is for (The Life Divine Book II Part II Chapter XV)

This is a summary of Sri Aurobindo's perception of Avidya, of ignorance of the human problem in general. It is against this multiple ignorance that the sage of Pondicherry would prescribe 'integral Yoga' as the medicine. An integral Yoga includes as a vital and indispensable element in its total and ultimate aim the conversion of the whole being into a higher spiritual consciousness and a larger divine existence. (The Synthesis of Yoga p.265)

Aurobindo suggests that not all may be able to plunge headlong into this "larger divine existence", and may be better advised to master the Karmayoga first. But the ultimate aim is to reach the "supra-mental consciousness" where the dominant reality is integration of will, emotion and consciousness, in "union with the Divine Reality of our being and all being (p-266)

4. The Nature of the New Consciousness

The main point of this paper merges at this point. It is Sri Aurobindo's point that overcoming the multifold ignorance through integral Yoga is the solution to the human problem. While agreeing with this solution as a partial answer, from my Christian perspective I need to go further in two dimensions beyond this solution.

Aurobindo admits that supra-mental consciousness, experiencing the unity of one's own being and of all being with the Divine is a "difficult distant, ultimate stage the end of a far off vista" not an immediate objective, but one that comes after jumping over many obstacles.

It is at this point of this ultimate objective that I wish to express my qualms. I submit that there are two qualifications to Sri Aurobindo's programme which are implied in it, but not adequately worked out. These two aspects are (a) community and (b) the material world.

Both are implied in Sri Aurobindo's perception that the ultimate aim is the realisation of the unity of one's own being and of all beings with the Divine. My contention is that, even this side of attaining the supra-mental consciousness this unity must be worked out in a different way as a guide to social living in a world of science and technology, and further, that such a working out of community life and scientific technological mastery will alter the content of the experience of the supramental.

There is no doubt that Sri Aurobindo and Sri Ramana had an experience of the overmind. My submission, presumptuous as it may seem, is that we need a different quality of self realisation through community living and scientific-technological mastery of the external world. And both in projecting the ultimate objective and in clearing the path to it. Community living and mastery of the external world through science and technology have an essential role.

Sri Aurobindo is unlikely to agree with me at this point. For him science-technology and perhaps even community life, belong to the world of multi-fold ignorance, to the inferior mind and not to ultimate reality. I suspect that, again speaking very presumptuously, that is what has gone wrong in Pondicherry, both at the Pondicherry Ashram and at Auroville, as well as at the ashram in Delhi. I am not suggesting that a harmonious community, knowing and producing through science-technology is the ultimate goal of humanity. But I am suggesting that the very quest must begin not from the ego's need for emancipation and realisation but from the perception, that our unity in being with other human persons and with the material world has to find expression in an integral community Yoga which aims at the emancipation of the whole of reality and not just of one's own ego.

According to Sri Aurobindo the pursuit is one of knowledge "a state of knowledge by which we can touch enter or know by identity this Eternal, Infinite and Absolute, a consciousness other than our ordinary consciousness of ideas and forms and things, a knowledge that is not what we call knowledge but something self-existent, everlasting, infinite (op cit.p.273) My contention is that the shaping of our ordinary consciousness has something to do with the content of the other consciousness into which we have to enter.

This is a major point of disagreement, and I do not want in the name of agreement between Christian and Hindus to blur this difference of perception which is crucial.

The Advaita Vedantin often takes the dogmatic position that change, which is related to time has nothing to do with Truth, which is unchanging and eternal. As a Christian I do not agree with this view. I more or less summarily reject the following view of Sri Aurobindo

"All cosmic existence or all that we call existence is a state of ignorance. All that is individual, all that is Cosmic has to be austere renounced by the seeker of the absolute truth. The Supreme quiescent Self or else the absolute Nihil is the sole Truth, the only object of spiritual knowledge. The state of knowledge the consciousness other than this temporal that we must attain is Nirvana, an extinction of ego, a cessation of all mental, vital and physical activities, of all activities whatsoever, a supreme illumined quiescence, the pure bliss of an impersonal tranquillity Self-absorbed and ineffable" (op cit p.273-274)

Without settling this question of the nature of truth, we cannot begin to work towards delineating the contours of the "emerging consciousness for a new human kind" At this point, I must go into a certain amount of tedious Christian theologising, in order to give some content to the expression of my own belief as a Christian.

5. The Nature of Truth and of Reality

Truth and Reality are difficult terms to expound or clarify. Etymologically the English word Truth is troth, that which is reliable and trustworthy. In the Christian tradition, the Hebrew expressions emeth and emunah both of which are translated 'truth' have the connotation of steadfastness and reliability. Steadfastness is different from unchangingness. For the Hebrew the unchanging is static, but steadfastness is dynamic, active, and compassionate, not impersonal. In fact in many instances truth is compounded with mercy and love and justice. Just to cite a few examples

- Deuteronomy 32:4 - "A God of Truth (emunah), no evil, merciful and upright."
- Genesis 24:27 - "Blessed be Yahweh the God of my master Abraham who never forsakes his steadfast love (hesed) and his truth (emeth) to my Master"
- Exodus 34:6 - "And Yahweh passed by in front of him (Moses) and Yahweh proclaimed: Yahweh, God merciful (raham) and gracious, forbearing, great in his unfailing love (hesed) and truth (emeth)."
- Samuel 2:6 - "And may Yahweh do steadfast love (hesed) and truth (emeth) with you"
- Psalms 25:10 - "All the ways of Yahweh are unfailing (hesed) and truth (emeth) to those who keep covenant with Him and his testimonies"
- Psalms 98:3 - "He (Yahweh) has remembered his unfailing love (hesed) and his truth (emunah) to the house of Israel"

These are not accidental coincidences. They form a pattern in the old testament. The words emeth, emunah and hesed have stood for truth, faithfulness, mercy, love and unfailing dependability.

And this is the basic Christian understanding of Truth not as "unsublated by subsequent experience" but as reliability and dependability. And this is the basic Christian understanding of Truth not as 'unsublated by subsequent experience' but as reality and dependability, in love, compassion and uprightness. This is not an impersonal understanding of truth. The idea of changelessness is there, but not in a static sense, but in the sense of an ever recurring but also surprising fidelity and reliability.

It is my philosophical contention that is the only kind of truth one can attain while we are in the body and possibly also without the body. Even when one experiences the unity of one's being with the being of all selves and of the world, this is not a knowledge which has no further to go. I know that vedantins believe that the Sakshatkara is the terminus beyond which there is neither road nor need to proceed. I cannot accept that belief, and I do hope that Sri Ramana and Sri Aurobindo are still proceeding along new paths.

As a Christian, I want to experience my oneness with God and with his universe, but I believe that when I do experience that oneness I would only have started on a quest which goes on ~~ad~~ indefinitely, with ever new surprises and new stages of realisation and growth into perfection. But I believe also that, once I proceed on the quest after having realised my oneness with the all, I would be doubly concerned to carry the rest of humanity and its alienated consciousness with me. I would want all humanity to experience this oneness and to desist from the follies that arise from the separated consciousness.

The important point is that, I do not experience truth as unchanging or static. Truth is power-dynamic power, compassionate, wise, creative power, power in love and freedom. Truth is not the stopping point, but the starting point of true existence. "You shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free" - free to live and not just be.

Truth is love, for God is love. Love is the all-binding element of consciousness and truth is experienced when my unity with all is experienced as love and not as a concept.

It is the truth-love combination that we have to experience in our consciousness requires this integration of truth with love, reality with compassion, of fidelity with godness, reliability with righteousness.

6) The Emergence of the New Consciousness

If emeth and hosed, reliable truth and unfailing love are thus integral to each other, and if our unity with all being is not merely a given, but also a task to be worked out through love, the spirituality for this new consciousness must break new ground, going beyond the integral yoga of Sri Aurobindo and beyond the simplistic advaita of many of its modern exponents.

Integrated Yoga still demands a shedding of all interest in the passing world revealed to our seven-fold ignorance. The new Yoga asks that we turn to this world with a new love, a new redeeming compassion towards it, and a passionate interest in it not to make it serve my ends, but to make it serve its own best interests.

I have no name for this new Yoga. To call it Integral Yoga would be to invite mis-understanding. It is a community Yoga which takes the vyavaharika loka seriously, seeking to make it a manifestation of love, beauty and Goodness.

It is at this point that we have to transcend all naive simplicisms. A heroically new spirituality is called for - a spirituality in which people of all faiths, and the secular devotees of science/

technology can all find a role to play, a participating role which completes and enriches the whole.

It goes beyond integral Yoga in the sense that it both acknowledges the evanescent and transtory character of this world, and still takes it seriously, just as we take food and air and water seriously, though we don't think they are the truth. But just as one cannot live without food and air and water human beings cannot realize the truth without going through this world of historical reality, and the problems of living together in it.

It takes this world sufficiently seriously to be pre-occupied with it as the arena where truth has to be made manifest loving, compassionate, life-giving, dependable truth. It takes community seriously enough not to be totally concerned about one's own personal sakshatkara or nirvana but to be passionately committed to the community's common quest for manifesting the compassionate, loving, dependable truth of God in the midst of all the struggle and strife, selfishness and discord. It can be called 'Integral Community Yoga' because it wants to integrate inner and outer reality in a holistic approach, because it seeks fulfilment of a community rather than that of individuals, and because it is a community discipline which demands the best in us.

7. Conclusion. 'The Basis of Integral Community Yoga.'

I submit that the basis of this "Integral Community Yoga" would be three-fold:

- a) The community's worship experience and awareness of the unseen dimensions of reality - enacted in dance and song, ritual and sacrifice, silence and reflection, meditation and contemplation. This is the formative experience of the new consciousness being formed - like the thousand petals of the lotus turning toward the Sun and receiving energy to grow together into a thing of beauty.
- b) The community's life together - life and relations with each other in the community and with those outside the community or the community's political economy - a life of simplicity and joy, love and compassion, peace and tranquility of caring actively for the needs of others, of resolving conflicts, of overcoming bitterness and meanness, jealousy and ambition, resentments and grudges; a community that radiates blessing, and is actively concerned for the whole of humanity without any narrow boundaries.
- c) The community's capacity to handle material reality through science and technology, art and music, in order to create new things of beauty and usefulness, with which to praise God, to bring out the glory of the universe and to serve all life and all truth.

The new consciousness wave that is abroad in the west has many possibilities, but many dangers also are inherent in that wave.

The fascination of the spirit world can be a trap, and without proper guidance people can slip into greater unfreedoms. I would like to suggest some rules of thumb for guidance:

- a) Something is not necessarily true because someone from the spirit-world communicates it to you through extraordinary revelations.
- b) the teaching of a person is not necessarily true or safe, just because that person can perform extraordinary miracles.
- c) the quality of a Guru or a religious community has always to be assessed through the truth, wisdom, love and goodness,

manifest in his or her or its life. Compassion for all, love without hatred or narrowness, non-desire for material gain or worldly popularity and honesty without any ostentation or false piety.

- d) Be wary of any religious teacher who panders to your love of ease, to your inclination to lust, or to your desire to be a worldly success.

Questions for Discussion

1. In our century, especially in its latter part, political economic structures have arisen which link all parts of the world to each other. The Nuclear crisis and the ecological crisis are perceived to be threats to all humanity and to all life. Most of these structures are far from harmonious, or based on justice or on concern for the whole of humanity. How do we transform these conflicting elements in international structures into creative possibilities for a new holistic consciousness?
2. National and International Religious structures are often reactionary, preventing the blossoming out of the universal consciousness, oppressive, keen on keeping their people ~~in~~ within the secure boundaries of a narrow religion. How do we break out of these without hurting people's religious feelings and convictions?
3. Each person carries within himself or herself a large number of different self-identities based on language, religion, region, nationality, race, sex, caste and so on. How many of these self-identities can be properly and securely rehabilitated within a more universal identity - my understanding of myself as a human person?
4. In the emerging new religious consciousness, are there not both dangers and possibilities? For example,
 - a) What is the point of a universal human consciousness unconcerned about the structures of social, political and economic injustice, and about the threat of extinction by nuclear catastrophe? Can a universal religion, as a pilgrimage to the inner depths, ignore the conflicts and injustice in the external world?
 - b) In the emerging new consciousness, do we look for a common world religion, or of a transformation of perspective within each religion which makes openness to other religions possible?
 - c) The concept of tolerance is inadequate for the relation between people of various religions. Tolerance is patronising and demeaning. We tolerate what we do not like or respect. How do we move from tolerance to informed understanding and critical respect between religions?
 - d) Communal conflicts are often seen as religious conflicts. Are they so - in Sri Lanka or India or Northern Ireland? What is the kind of consciousness that leads to communal conflicts.

THE EMERGING NEW WORLD ORDER AND THE POWER OF THE POWERLESS

Some Reflections

(Paulos Mar Gregorios)

1. It is one of the great ironies of history that Soviet President Gorbachov's Globalist "New Thinking" has ultimately resulted in consequences disastrously contrary to what he had intended. There is less security in the world than before; there is a new sense of helplessness on the part of the powerless; the prospect of a world without war has receded further; the victims of injustice have no strong champion of their cause any more; the world has become more miserable than ever before since the second world war. The Gulf War, alas, is as much a consequence of Soviet New Thinking as of anything else.

2. This asymmetric, short-duration, super-high-tech war has achieved more than the liberation of Kuwait from Iraqi aggression and occupation. It seems to have been even more effective in achieving six or seven of the covert goals of USA and her allies:

a. Israel, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Iran, Kuwait and Syria all wanted the rising power of Iraq to be curbed: this was also in the Allied interest, but it would have been counter-productive (strong Arab reaction) if Israel had been allowed to do the job on her own as she wanted to: now it has been done, with minimum cost to Israel and with maximum winning over of the Arabs into the allied camp. If the USA and Iraq had really negotiated, such a war would have been impossible, because the Americans knew that Saddam Hussein was willing to withdraw his troops from Kuwait if he had been treated with dignity and offered some small compromises on the Palestinian question and a little financial contribution from Kuwait. Without a war, Iraq could not have been crushed so brutally.

b. Ever since the collapse of the 'Soviet Threat' in 1988, there was no justification for stationing American troops in an outpost like Western Europe. The Gulf War gave the Allies a pretext for a new military outpost in the Middle East, so essential to Allied imperialist interests.

c. USA and Allies have been looking for an opportunity to field-test and demonstrate the prowess of their new post SDI high-tech weapons; a first class sales pitch has been made for western armaments, and the Soviet Union and others can no longer compete in the arms market. The important thing is

that the human cost of the test is borne by the Two-third world people of Iraq and Kuwait.

d. The UN has been a major force in the world resisting Allied hegemony in the world. It has now been captured and domesticated.

e. A real boost has been given to the waning arms industry on which the market economy's health is now based. The big corporations, the "death dealers", have now been helped enough so that they can continue to contribute liberally to the political process that sustains the market economy.

f. The USA has been enabled to assert its uncontested global leadership, to test friends, and to severely warn any would-be challengers to that global authority.

g. The cost of the operation has been largely paid by Japan, Germany, Saudi Arabia and others, and the new contracts for reconstruction of Kuwait and possibly of Iraq, along with a few mammoth arms sales already effected, will more than compensate for the rest of the expenditure. Overall, the war has been a "good deal" for the West, money-wise.

3. The short Gulf War has radically altered the power configuration in the world; categories of yesterday no longer fit. It is not profitable to keep on talking about superpowers or unipolar versus multipolar or bipolar world. What we have is a global market economy which now comprehends almost all countries in the world including USSR, China and Vietnam, and the USA has emerged as the General Manager of the New Global Order, assisted by her White Allies as assistant managers. The latter do not always agree with everything the General Manager does; but to disagree with him openly may have rather catastrophic consequences; so they can only go along, hoping some day the G M will make a major faux pas when they can oust him from power and take his place.

4. For the powerless, especially for a country like India, the question arises: where to look for some countervailing power to offset the power of the GM? Economically the two most powerful Assistant Managers are Germany (or the European Community, if you like and if you believe in it) and Japan. But they have to play the GM's game; at least for the time being, for their very survival. And there is a private game played by the GM and the two most powerful Assistant Managers. The GM knows these two are rivals who have to be fixed before they manage to overthrow him and take his place. But he also knows that he has to keep them as allies until later

he would have strength enough to crush them.

5. Gone are the days when Mrs. Gandhi, threatened by the present GM during the Bangladesh War, could send her personal envoy and get an Indo Soviet Treaty in the bag in three days. The collapse of the Soviet Economy and of its Policy of the Defense of Socialism, has also led, it would appear, to the collapse of the effectiveness of India's foreign policy. Without Soviet Military power willing to confront Western Allied power, can India sustain a foreign policy based on principles of international morality?

6. The other bastion of a principled global policy was the United Nations. It was a force to be reckoned with, till the Gulf War. It could stand up to the highhandedness of the USA and allies on many occasions. But now the USA has shown remarkable skill in capturing and castrating the UN. The UN Resolution gave carte blanche to member nations to "use all necessary means" to get Iraq out of Kuwait, while Israel was still occupying Arab lands for decades. Syria was occupying part of Lebanon and Turkey part of Cyprus: this was a blatant betrayal of all that the UN stood for: it was a rape and violation of its own charter. It is common knowledge that that UN Resolution was bought by bribe and cajolement. It is an unconstitutional resolution, fully ultra vires. But it has served the USA's purpose.

7. Now it seems the USA is interested in solving the Middle East problem under its own aegis, again bringing in the UN in so far as it suits American policy aims. It will take a lot of doing to bring back a semblance of real power to the UN. The UN System will also come under the GM unless someone sees the danger and does something drastic about it, like breaking the power of the Five Permanent members of the Security Council by amending the Charter itself.

8. Two-third World countries will need to wake up, and see the new global power configuration picture with fresh eyes. Not much use hanging on to old and obsolete structures like the NAM or even to more creative but largely ineffective ideas like SAARC and South-South Co-operation. The Two-third world is far from united, and the GM is interested in keeping it that way. It is unrealistic to suppose that even an India China alliance could bring the Two-third world together on a common platform. But China is an important player in the new power game, and India's interests are certainly in mending fences with China and in forging a common policy with other Two-third World countries.

9. The Two-third World will need the friendship and support

of all progressive elements both in the West as well as in ex-socialist countries. A New International will need to be conceived and a platform formulated, to counter the new power structure and to seek together dignity, freedom, justice, peace and a life-sustaining environment for all humanity. If by next June India has some vigorous leadership - a highly unlikely prospect, as of now - it could take the initiative to create such a progressive global forum, not necessarily anti-west or anti-American, but basically committed to democratic freedom, justice, peace and a healthy environment. Without some government support, it will be difficult to make such a global forum effective; but it is not inconceivable that the initiative comes from institutes, informal groups and non-governmental organisations.

10. It seems beyond doubt that the countervailing power we need is not military, but economic and social-cultural: the power of the people, the power of more than 4000 million dispossessed and marginalised people; but peoples' power organised and mobilised. The sense of outrage at the presence and arrogant manifestation of non-responsible technological-military power seems widespread, but still remains faltering in expression. To give unmistakable expression to that sense of deep moral outrage, and to demand a more responsible, democratic control of global power seems the priority of the day.

11. India certainly needs a new foreign policy; that policy, if not based on some measure of economic independence, both at home and in international relations, will be based more on expediency than on principle. In fact India's foreign policy in the Gulf Conflict has been depressingly based on short-term expediency; it seems clearly our responsibility as citizens to demand that the next election struggle among our political parties be based on more substance than just 'a stable government'. Without an enlightened vision of the new global situation, neither stability nor economic prosperity with some measure of justice can be attained in our chaotic 'stable'.

12. The process of reflection on our foreign policy need not await the outcome of the next general elections. It can begin now.

I have a singular honour today, mostly undeserved, of being the recipient of the Otto Nuschke award. I want on this occasion to pay my tribute to Otto Nuschke (1883-1957), whose last speech in the CDU Parteitag in Weimar resounded with these words of exhortation:

"Christian democrats, (let us give) our whole strength for mutual understanding, disarmament and co-existence, and the promotion of Peace and Happiness for all peoples".

(Gerhard Fischer, Otto Nuschke Ein Lebensbild,

Union Verlag, Berlin, 1983, p. 272)

In the same speech Otto Nuschke expressed the view (in 1956) that just as the second world war ended with emancipation of all the slavic people of Eastern Europe, the day would soon dawn when the non-white peoples of the two-third world would find themselves free from political economies of exploitation and oppression.

I salute the memory of Otto Nuschke - heroic resister against totalitarianism, far-sighted friend of the human race, faithful son of the Evangelical Church in Deutschland, Champion of the struggle of the oppressed and exploited classes, effective effective publicist for the cause of socialism, seasoned politician and one of the founders of the Christian Democratic Union of Deutschland.

May I be permitted to share on this occasion, in honouring the memory of this stalwart servant of socialism and ardent fighter for justice, peace and dignity for all, a few of my own thoughts on the future of humanity and the current debate about the tension between Global Humanism and the Class Struggle.

One engages in such futurological speculation with much hesitation. So much that economic prophets predicted has failed to come true. Capitalism has not yet collapsed. The final triumph of socialism is still in the future. New and unexpected factors arise and change the course of history presumed to have been predictable. The forces of reaction seem to gain new strength from unexpected quarters. The market economy world has shown a resilience which few thought it possessed. It has survived many crises through devious and sometimes anti-human devices. Manipulation of the money market, juggling fiscal and exchange relations, creating artificial markets for armaments by fomenting local wars and false fears of foreign attack; securing billion-dollar orders with hare-brained schemes like strategic Defense Initiative, making nations insecure through strategies of 'limited nuclear war' heightening tension and promoting the arms race de-stabilizing nations to advance the arms trade - so many devices have been found to keep a sick world market economy artificially propped up.

The major instrument for the defense of the capitalist system has been the uncanny alliance among Transnational Corporations, military establishments, and the institutions and personnel of scientific-technological research, in order to control and exploit the political economic process in many countries. The tentacles of this world-wide system reach into all countries - socialist countries not excluded. Techniques of a very advanced nature have now been developed to wage war on non-cooperating countries through de-stabilization and exploitation of internal conflicts within such nations. But also sophisticated techniques have been developed to co-opt socialist systems into the world market economy system.

The enemy that socialism has to contend with looks gigantic, sinister and more sophisticated than many first thought.

While socialists cannot be intimidated by the seemingly giant strength and wily cunning strategies of the enemy, neither can they afford to under-estimate the forces against which they have to contend.

There is no doubt, however, that even this great struggle against the forces of reaction should take second place when put side by side with the other great peril - a possible nuclear holocaust which can finish off all classes, exploiters as well as exploited. Not everyone, even in the developed countries, is aware how close this peril of a nuclear war has

been several times in the recent past. Only those who are privy to what is going on behind the scenes realize how close to us the peril of omnicide has always been and still is.

The recent signing of the INF treaty, (a historic and most significant step in the hesitant and unsteady progress towards a world without nuclear weapons,) should not lull us into some sort of euphoria. The world crisis is still very much there. The market economy system has not opted for perpetual peaceful co-existence with socialism. We will be fooling ourselves if we deduce from the four recent summit meetings between the USA and USSR that the western establishment has given up the policy of confrontation and opted for detente and disarmament. It is not possible even today for the socialist nations to let down their defenses or relax in their vigilance.

At the same time it is not possible for the socialist nations to concentrate all their efforts on the defense of socialist values and institutions. To do so has already proved to be inviting another kind of danger - a repressive political system, a stagnant economy, brooding discontent and the collapse of creativity among the people. Socialism can thrive only on a democratic foundation, and the requirements of military defense are always counter-democratic, whether in the market economy or in the socialist system.

I am aware of the fact that the GDR economy is by no means stagnant, that even among the socialist countries the economic achievement of the G.D.R. is without parallel. But that does

not mean the absence of major problems in a situation of encirclement by fully armed market economy system determined to overthrow socialism.

It is indeed a dilemma. A socialist party loses all significance if it does not keep the class struggle at the top of its agenda. There is no way to succeed in building socialism without going through the necessary struggles to overthrow the powers of oppression and exploitation - both in one's own nation as well as internationally. And yet precisely in pursuing that struggle one dare not provoke the enemy to the point of effectually committing racial suicide. It is all right occasionally to taunt the enemy with being just a paper tiger; but the fact still remains that there is no limit to what desperate madness even in a paper tiger can do.

On the other hand, there is a way out of this dilemma, a dilemma, a difficult way, nevertheless a way that needs to be tried. It is indeed a strategy, but not a dishonest one. This requires the following basic affirmations:

- (a) In the present crisis of human history there is no viable alternative to peaceful co-existence between various political economic systems, especially if they possess nuclear weapons capable of destroying all of us.
- (b) The only possible choice is between armed co-existence on the basis of mutual deterrence by nuclear weapons on the one hand and on the other an uneasy, competitive, but friendly and co-operative co-existence in a setting

of detente and disarmament.

(c) To chose the option of armed co-existence is to make it exceedingly difficult for socialist societies to be genuinely democratic, for the working people to be genuinely creative, and for a high standard of living to be assured for all in a socialist country.

(d) On the other hand, the option of armed co-existence based on mutual deterrence, at least in the short term, works to the advantage of market economy capitalism; for that system's survival depends on constantly expanding markets; and these seem to be assured by an accelerating arms race and by the world-wide growth of militarism fostered by deterrence-based co-existence. Capitalism may not succeed permanently in promoting the arms race and thereby perpetually expanding its market. It may collapse from its own debt (or credit) burden and loss of creativity induced by over-investment of resources and personnel in non-productive military consumption. But the system has shown, so far, rather marvellous and resilient ingenuity in facing its crises and in overcoming them temporally. By persisting in a deterrence-based co-existence, the socialist countries would be giving backhanded encouragement to the market economy system.

(e) If on the other hand a situation of true detente and disarmament can be achieved and socialist economies can not only drastically cut down their defense expenditures, but also scale down their posture of total vigilance, socialism stands a better chance of reaching the standards

of living necessary for a dignified human existence, and even of outstripping the market economies in both quality and price of consumer goods offered to the world market.

In other words the second alternative, namely peaceful co-existence of socialist economies with market economy countries, in an ambiance of detente and disarmament, is the better strategy for socialism's waging war against systems of oppression and exploitation.

There is little chance that the market economy system can survive much longer in its present form if the continuing arms race and the accelerating growth of militarism in the world were not there. Competing in a true atmosphere of unrepressive freedom and unarmed co-existence based on mutual trust, with renewed creativity in economic and cultural activity and true democratic freedoms, socialism can beat capitalism in sportsmanlike combat - so long as the game is played according to rules and properly umpired. The rules of common security have yet to be developed. There can be no reliable umpire other than a representative body of all humanity.

There is some chance that there can be a comparatively peaceful transition to socialism world-wide. I say 'comparatively' because privileged classes do not give up their prerogatives without a struggle. And yet we have seen in India 526 Rajahs and Maharajas giving up without much of a struggle. Of course some people from the privileged classes, as well as lots of people from the working classes, will seek

privilege and undue advantage within a socialist system, as history has already taught us. That calls for a different kind of vigilance on the part of socialism.

The collapse of capitalism may be accompanied by some last-ditch struggles characterized by madness and despair. It is therefore important, for the sake of common security, to eliminate nuclear weapons from our planet and to ban them effectively so that this last ditch madness does not become nuclear madness. We must make the world safe by eliminating nuclear weapons altogether from earth and sea, sky and space. In a nuclear world we will always be insecure, because madness is always a possibility.

It is in this context that we note the outstanding efforts of the Peace Movement in the GDR to eliminate nuclear weapons and to create Nuclear Weapons Free Zones wherever possible. I want at this point to salute the government, the peace movements and the people of the GDR for the high quality leadership they have given and are still giving in the world-wide movement for peace with justice, for elimination of all nuclear weapons, and for common security without weapons of mass destruction.

It is in this context that we take a look at only one of the many points raised in the current debate about Perestroika-Glasnost and New Thinking.

Two questions have been raised and need to be answered: Does the Global humanism of the New Thinking associated with

the concepts of perestroika-glasnost really displace the centrality of the notion of class struggle which has guided marxist thought in the past? If it actually does so, can such a global humanist be justified in marxist terms?

My own tentative answer to both questions is a qualified yes.

There has always been a dialiectical tension between the concepts and strategies of class-struggle on the one hand and the need for peaceful co-existence of opposing ideologies and political economic systems on the other. To abandon this tension would be to adopt a naively Trotskyite notion of permanent revolution. Permanent revolution is a respectable Marxist concept, but has not always been a practical option, especially when the oppressor is armed with weapons of mass destruction. The fact that the party of the working class is also so armed does not reduce the risk of a permanent revolution or military confrontation that could lead to a nuclear holocaust which would destroy all classes, annihilate the achievements of centuries of human knowledge and culture, and imperil the very existence of any but the most stunted forms of life on our planet. There can be no moral justification for a class struggle where nuclear-military confrontation between the classes could lead to omnicide and boicide at worst, and at best to a destruction of a large part of humanity and its achievements, and to a permanent poisoning of the total biosphere.

Faced with that kind of a choice, a genuine class struggle which aims at the emancipation of the oppressed and exploited classes, has to choose a strategy in which the elimination of nuclear weapons from the planet, the protection of space from becoming a launching pad for directed energy weapons, and the painstaking creation of a system of common security for all take a higher priority than military confrontation.

The working classes cannot abandon the class struggle or actually displace it from its centrality in assessment of reality and in formulation of strategy. What is set aside for the time being is not the class struggle as such, but a particular form of class confrontation that could lead to heavy and unacceptable damage to the oppressed and exploited classes.

Global humanism is thus not an alternative to the class struggle, but only its original framework and necessary basis. The class struggle as a concept was from the beginning based on the primary principle of socialist humanism, and was never more than a means to the emancipation of all classes from oppressive and exploitative structures, and to the establishment of a classless global human society with peace, security, justice, dignity and freedom of creativity for all. The victory of the working class can only be a means to go on to a global society of freedom, dignity and justice.

Divorced from that original socialist humanism, the concept of class struggle can become a dangerous dogma and a mis-leading strategy. There is, I sadly note, arising all over the world in leftist political circles, a dogmatic and non-contextual emphasis on class struggle and class confrontation which does not take adequately seriously the peril of a nuclear holocaust. These circles, strangely enough have a record of fervent campaigning in the past for nuclear disarmament as a high priority for the revolutionary struggle. But they now seem to feel that the peril of a nuclear catastrophe is neither imminent nor so alarming. They seem to feel that the nuclear powers of the market economy world would not attempt even a "limited nuclear war", since these powers have correctly assessed its enormous consequences to themselves. In other words, to put it bluntly, these leftist circles have enough confidence in security by mutual deterrence to make them under-estimate the real danger of such a "limited nuclear war" breaking out by design or by accident. They seem to ignore the fact that such a "limited nuclear war" has been and still forms part of western military strategy. They also fail to take into account the fact that the Pentagon which was in the beginning largely opposed to President Reagan's original strategy of "star wars" as a defence initiative, later approved it as part of an offensive strategy including a decapitating first strike and the of a limited nuclear war to fight off the weakened but still considerable retaliatory attack which is to be expected.

CRITICISM OF THE NEW THINKING

Among the leftist parties which have raised questions about General Secretary Gorbachov's statements on perestroika-glasnost one counts the American Communist Party and the Communist Party of India, (Marxist). Gus Hall, General Secretary of the American Communist Party, for example, warns us of the danger in accepting wrong ideas in the name of "new thinking". In an article entitled "The World We Preserve Must Be Livable"², he says:

"Throughout the history of the working class movement, the 'something new' concepts have always been used to bypass, cover up or eliminate the concept of the class struggle. To eliminate the idea of the class struggle one has to accept that somehow the capitalist class is changing its inherent nature, giving up its drive for maximum profits. To eliminate the idea of the class struggle one has to explain how the basic laws of capitalist development have somehow changed. This is impossible."

Gus Hall poses the question : "should all struggles for a better life, including the class struggle and the national liberation struggles, be subordinated to the struggle to preserve humanity?" He answers his own question with a "no".

-
2. The Marxist, New Delhi, Vol. VI (2), April-June 1988
pp. 58 ff
 3. ibid. p. 59

His argument is that most of the oppressed and exploited peoples of the world are not interested in the idea of preserving humanity, if that is divorced from the struggle to make life more work living. He takes Gorbachov to task (without specifically mentioning his name) for a 1987 statement by Yevgeni Ambartsumov in the World Marxist Review:

"I do not rule out a negative reaction particularly among those who continue to take a fetishistic view of the class struggle although Lenin, as we all know, put the interests of social development as a whole above the class interests of the proletariat. The entire world has today found itself in a situation in which precisely human interests must be given priority. In this lies the essence of our new way of thinking" *

Academician Ambartsumov's statement can be mis-understood as anti-class-struggle. But in fact he speaks only of a priority for global human interests, and not of abandoning the class struggle in the interests of human survival.

Looking at the same issue from a Two-third World perspective, the C.P.I.(M) documents question the 'New Thinking' of the C.P.S.U. In a critique of General Secre Gorbachev's Report on the 70th Anniversary of the October Revolution, the CPI (M) Central Committee (May 3-6, 1988) adopted a resolution which said among other things:

4. World Marxist Review No. 10 (1987) p.152. This was i response to an earlier article by Dmitri Gorbachev entitled "Become a Citizen of the World" (W.N.R.No.5/1

- (a) Gorbachov is fundamentally wrong in assuming that the world is becoming more and more inter-dependent and integral. It is "unscientific" to isolate the internationalisation of economic life from the fact of class struggle which is integral to global economic life.⁵
- (b) Gorbachov is wrong again in assuming that Capitalism is willing or able to adapt itself to the conditions "of a nuclear weapons free world, and to a new and equitable economic order."⁶
- (c) Gorbachov is wrong in arguing from the fact that there has been no third world war that Capitalism is becoming peaceful. It has waged or taken part already (since the second world war) in a hundred or more local wars.⁷
- (d) Gorbachov is wrong in arguing that "at the present level of technology and organisation of production, reconversion and demilitarisation of the (capitalist) economy are feasible". Capitalism and militarism are integral to each other, and the capitalist military machine can be converted to peaceful use only when the capitalist class is no longer in power.⁸
- (e) Gorbachev under-estimates the strength and significance of Third World liberation struggles in the total movement of emancipation of the working class.

5. The Marxist Vol. VI (2). April-June 1988, p. 14

6. ibid. p. 18

7. ibid. pp. 20ff

8. ibid pp. 26ff

The Indian Marxist Party at a later Central Committee Meeting (August 8-10, 1988) came to a more positive assessment of the New Thinking. They have reaffirmed the following principles, on which they generally agree with the CPSU.

- (a) The people cannot be replaced by the Party. There is no alternative to direct involvement of the people in governing society, and managing the economy.⁹
- (b) The Party has a guiding and leading role in society as a vanguard of the working class.
- (c) The growth of bureaucracy is indeed "a serious impediment, and, if unchecked, becomes a danger" ¹⁰
- (d) The New Thinking in the Soviet Union should be understood also in the light of the practical problems encountered by the Soviet economy.

The August 1988 resolution of the CPI (M) cautions the New Thinking on the following points:

- (a) Too severe and one-sided criticism of the past can be counter-productive. The assessment of Stalin suffers from overlooking this positive achievements of the period.
- (b) The emphasis on individual human rights should never be at the expense of a basic socialist vision and perspective.

9. "On Recent Developments in the Soviet Union" The Marxist

VI (2) p. 34ff

10 ibid p. 36.

- (c) The working class and the Party of the working class have a special role in advancing socialism, and this should not be ignored in adopting any global humanist or national democratic perspective.

This is indeed a sober and more balanced statement than the May 88 statement of the Central Committee of C.P.I.(M)

TOWARDS A CONCLUSION

For a non-Communist like the present speaker, it seems obvious that the New Thinking in the Soviet Union did raise some questions in the minds of many socialist parties whether the central marxist notion of Class Struggle was being superseded by a notion of Global Humanism. These fears seem to be not well grounded.

No one can question the fact that the nuclear-environmental peril threatens the survival of humanity, and that the end of humanity would also mean the end of all classes. Survival is important above all, say some, since there can be no class struggle without it. Others like Gus Hall say: Survival by itself is not a worthy goal if what survives is an unjust and exploitative society.

Progressive people in the Two-Third World have always held that Peace without Justice is not worth striving for. What all of us need to distinguish at this time is between Peace and Disarmament as such, and avoiding a nuclear catastrophe. If confrontation would lead to catastrophe, then

confrontation may not be in the long term interests of the Class Struggle. If de-emphasizing the class struggle would help to promote detente and avoid confrontation then why not, some say.

In any case the de-emphasizing of the class struggle can only be a temporary matter of strategy and tactics; the socialist parties cannot afford to set aside the primacy and centrality of the class struggle. But if it is known to the Market Economy people that such a de-emphasis is only a temporary and tactical matter how seriously will they take it?

The effectiveness of the New Thinking, I believe, should not be assessed on the basis of a false dichotomy between global humanism and class struggle. It should prove its worth by creating a climate of detente leading to concrete plans for total elimination of all weapons of mass destruction and to global co-operation for saving the biosphere from catastrophe. If it succeeds in these two matters, as well as in the improvement of the standards of quality and effectiveness in socialist production, then the cause of socialism would be truly advanced.

Pursuit of Truth
Anticipating the Future

(Paulos Mar Gregorios)

Forgive me a philosophical preamble about this title which was given to me. Do you think Truth can be pursued ? If it were to be capable of such pursuit, two assumptions would be implied, neither of which I can accept. First that Truth is running away or walking away, if you like and has to be pursued ! Could that be true ? hardly ! Second, I, the pursuer, am somehow outside the truth, self-contained and independent, and that I can pursue truth which is outside me ! Hardly hardly !

So what are we talking about ? Even this business of anticipating the future is a bit of bunkum. Of course the whole of modern science is about predicting what (B) will happen, if something we control (A) is done. New Scientific hypotheses are assessed as better or worse than the existing one mainly in terms of their enlarged predictive power, fitting more cases than before. So science is all anticipation of the future in accordance with known laws, based on the principle of causality operating in time.

But mind you, if you are a good philosopher - Eastern or Western - you should have trouble with causality and also with time and space. For these are highly questionable as philosophical categories. In our own civilization it was Nagarjuna who taught us a thing or two about the problems of the notion of causality. He showed by a brilliant display of logical pyrotechnics in which our own Tarkasastra had attained a peak of proficiency already in the pre-Christian era which western logic would even today find hard to attain, how the effect that is different from the cause cannot logically exist and that there is no such thing as causality.

In the west, Hume and Russell demonstrated the logical untenability of causality by a different logic, by arguing that post hoc need not imply propter hoc, and that we have actually knowledge only of one event following another, but no direct knowledge of causality as such; that is, we know B follows A in most or all cases, but we do not know that A causes B.

Conted... 2.

Modern physics has come to deny the existence of time and space as in any sense absolute, that they are dimensions of human existence and perception, and that they are relative or relational. Causality requires time, since cause and effect are temporally related. But if time itself is perceptual and not absolutely real, how can there be any causality that is absolute ?

If time, space and causality have thus to go down the drain of such a ruthless logic, then what truth is there for us to perceive, either in the past, present, or future ? Is there something called a future at all ? What is science trying to predict then ?

The Soviets have recently published an interesting little volume called the Futurology Fiasco which is worth leafing through. They question all this glip talk about projecting a future of unprecedented prosperity for most of the Western world based on unwarranted extrapolations from the post-war economic boom. Their main criticism is that predictions about the future should be made on a more realistic assessment of present reality and current trends. It cannot be over-pessimistic or over-optimistic.

Western futurologists seem to be totally unconcerned about what happens to the 3000 million people who are still struggling with poverty and injustice. It is at this point that the way we perceive ourselves and what is around us shows the need for re-examination. So before we speak about Truth, let us have a little look at how we perceive that Truth. It is not pursuit of truth, but the perception of reality that we shall be concerned with in this paper, even in anticipating the future.

I Methodological Considerations

A. Optimism and Pessimism

We have just come through 194⁸⁴~~8~~ - and lived through a bad year, but the world we lived through last year was very little like what George Orwell's 1984 (London, 1949) or Aldous Huxley's Brave New World (London 1932) had predicted.

Conted..... 3.

Our nightmare society of today is so different from what the brilliant Englishmen had suggested they would be - citizens reduced to robots and controlled by an all-powerful super-state. The fact is that people are no more robots today than they were in 1932 or 1945 and the state seem to be so helpless in resolving simple problems like war, the arms race, poverty and injustice. Certainly the futurologists of the first half of the century were wide of the mark.

In the 70's of our era, we saw the collapse of the earlier optimism of the decades prior to that. For example no one was talking too much about the Hastings Report about The Year 2000, which painted such a rosy picture for the end of the century when everybody in the world would have a U.S. \$ 20,000 income.

Robert L Heilbroner's gloomy An Inquiry into the Human Prospect (New York, 1974) told us that the economy and the world can only get much worse and that the golden age was over. Even Daniel Bell, the prophet of the post-industrial society and ardent advocate of capitalism, published his The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism (London, 1976), and began predicting a gloomy future based on computations of new scarcities. In Japan, the Economic Research Centre forecast that the "advanced country disease" will persist in the foreseeable future - with its symptoms of high unemployment, high inflation, and the depression of the market.

On the other hand, the Marxists have consistently always been optimists - at least in theory. They are sure that the inexorable laws of society will lead to the collapse of capitalism and the triumph of socialism. "Historical Optimism" is an integral part of Marxist ideology. Boris Ponomarev, Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union puts it this way :

" They (Communists) are convinced that Man's future is to be a society without wars, without bloodshed among nations, because the causes of war will vanish, and the social forces that have something to gain from spreading hatred and distrust, that prosper on war, international conflict, and tension will disappear into the past forever. In the future society there will be no militarism or spending on armaments. As Marx wrote inspiringly, it will be a

society whose international rule will be Peace, because its national ruler will be everywhere the same - Labour. War will be excluded from the life of humankind because there will be no motive for it. Society will achieve disarmament". (B.Ponomarev, "How Marxists see the Future of Mankind" in Socialism, Theory and Practice, (126) January, 1984 p.59)

It seems that in the Two-third world, where most of humanity dwells, we have little independent thought, except to follow either the market economy pessimism or socialist optimism or a blend of the two, without logical consistency. In India, the blend is always a strange combination of fatalism on the one hand, and a modest optimism of the "chalega" variety. We think anything that breaks down can be repaired, and if spare parts are not available we will make our own.

This cautious optimism is now in full bloom with the advent of the Rajiv regime with its doctrine of clean politics, clean administration and hard work.

Rajiv himself does not belong either to the market economy pessimism or to the scientific socialist optimism. In fact in all of us there are four factors inter-acting namely

- (a) optimism about history
- (b) Pessimism about history
- (c) Optimism about the possibilities of human effort
- (d) Pessimism about human effort

Rajiv Gandhi belongs to the category (c) where the main stress is on human effort - which is also in Marxist historical optimism; but in Rajiv's case, his effort optimism does not seem to be based on any ideological grounds, except that such effort optimism is not characteristically Indian. One can even attribute it to his Parsee background.

The important thing in any anticipation of the future is what proportions of the two kinds of optimism or pessimism we incorporate in our ^{no}prognostications, consciously or otherwise quite often without any rational arguments for such optimism or pessimism whether about history or about the effectiveness of our efforts.

Conted.....5.

B. Perception of Reality - Some Ground Rules

It is clear now that absolute scientific objectivity is a myth. It is a popular myth that the computer is infallible and objective. Of course, the computer, being a machine, does not make mistakes; it can only fail, as machines often do - fail to function properly. But that rules out infallibility. What about objectivity? Objectivity, like causality, has been one of the casualties of recent developments in the philosophy of science. All knowledge, it is now seen, invariably involves an element of subjectivity. This subjectivity is clearly seen at two points. In particle physics, it is now clear that the measurement of mass or velocity of a particle inevitably involves the adding of \hbar quantum of energy in the process of measurement which affects the measured particle, so that there is no way we can know the particle objectively. This inescapability of the subjectivity of the measuring process is one aspect. The other is the insight that all perception and all scientific knowledge is based on a hypothesis or theory, which is a creation of the human mind in its subjectivity. The object of study does not supply the hypothesis. It is a subjective creation in human language.

These modern insights have now led to the re-instatement of the subjective in all knowledge. There is a category-structure through which we perceive reality and which we create. Aristotle tried to say that the category-structure was a Priori-independent of experience. His list had ten items which can be compared with Kant's Twelve, which was the redemption of the Aristotelian categories after the British had done them down.

Aristotle	Kant
Substance	----- unity
Quantity	Quantity ----- plurality
Quality	----- Totality
Relation	----- Reality
Where	Quality ----- Negation
When	----- Limitation
Position	----- Inherence
State	----- Subsistence
Action	----- causality
Passion	Relation ----- dependence
	----- Community
	----- reciprocity
	with ^S pace and Time being not categories of understanding but a <u>priori forms of sensibility</u>

The Kantian scheme is of course neater and avoids doubtful categories like substance. For Aristotle the categories are objective, non-reducible, Sci generis. For Kant the categories are admittedly subjective and apply only to the phenomena and not to things in themselves or to noumena.

Today modern Hermeneutics has moved beyond all such fixed category scheme as applying only to pure reason - whereas other categories become operative for practical reason and for critique of judgment. Dilthey was one of the first to clarify the problem in Kant of taking the critique of pure reason (akin to scientific knowledge) as normative and the others as lesser or less pure forms of knowledge. By positing history rather than physical sciences as normative, German thought took a line different from the Anglo-Saxon one. But Dilthey failed to lay down any valid ground rules for objectivity in history. Husserl's attempt to overcome the epistemological problem of objectivity in the historical and scientific realms has also come to grief - even though the attempt was to ground objectivity in a transcendental subjectivity.

Contd..... 7.

Heidegger put back the concept of interest and therefore of feeling ^{and} subjectivity in knowledge. He also succeeded in disclosing the fore-structure of understanding - that of projecting a tentative understanding which is then to be confirmed by experience. He helped us understand science itself as partaking of this hermenentic circle, in which, in a sense, you can know only that which you already know - the hypothesis has to be in the mind before it can be applied to reality by projection, anticipating experimental confirmation.

It was GADAMER who pointed out to us that our prejudice against prejudice, an inheritance from the Enlightenment, stood in the way of recognizing the inescapability of prejudice in all understanding. Our only choice is between prejudices - bad prejudices or better prejudices.

According to the Enlightenment, it is wrong to accept any authority of tradition and everyting has to be brought before the judgment seat of reason. As Gadamer puts it, according to the European Enlightenment:

" It is not tradition, but reason that constitutes the ultimate source of all authority. What is written down is not necessasilly true. We may have superior knowledge: this is the maxim~~us~~ with which the modern enlightenment approaches tradition and which ultimately leads it to undertake historical research" 2

-
1. See especially Section II A of his Truth and Method (E.T. Sheed & Ward, London, 1975, pp 235 ft) on "The Hermeneutic Circle and The Problem of Prejudices "
 2. op.cit. p.221

Conted..... 8.

Underlying this are the twin concepts of the sovereignty of human reason and the idea of progress. Humanity has made progress. We are constantly moving towards Paradise, which is in the future - not in the past. So those who lived in an earlier time are less informed and more stupid. We have superior knowledge and superior tools of finding out or "pursuing" the truth. That was the claim of the Enlightenment.

Contrary to this reason-exalting and progress-dogmatic tendency of the Enlightenment, we have also in Europe the opposite tendency. Romanticism suggests that the old was gold and we should recover it. There is much of it in the modern "greenie" or "environmentalist" movement. Rousseau was its prophet. Paradise was in the past - not in the future. We lived close to nature in the past, and industrial civilisation has now taken us away and put us in chains. *Thus because of looking back to the past becomes more popular in the future becomes more bleak*

Few people recognize the fact that western civilisation embodies both these opposite tendencies. We ourselves are in the grips of these two tendencies of thought - which is the counter-part of the reality/effort pessimism/optimism. But in this other dialectic of Paradise-in-the-past/ Paradise-in-the-future, or Romanticism/ Enlightenment, or Tradition/ Futurism, the Enlightenment or Reason has taken the upper hand and Romanticism was tamed by it into "historicism" and the "historical method", where the past is important, but the past only as analysed and re-constructed by reason.

The Enlightenment had one goal - the subjection of all authority to reason. Europe, in both the French Revolution and in the Enlightenment, put reason on the throne of authority, and we Indians who have been trained or brain-washed in the system of western thought, are now alienated from our own more sophisticated approach in the "pursuit" of truth or perception of reality.

We had our own naive exaltation of reason and propositional truth in the Nyāya system with its six categories - (1) dravya (substance), (2) guna (quality), (3) sambandha (relation), (4) Karma (action), (5) Sāmānya (universals or abstracts) and (6) abhāva (absence). In contrast, we have also the Vedantic approach to knowledge - away from mere reason and language, reducing both to the world of avidya or nescience (thus modern science would be non-science), and recommending the path of śabda or authority or śruti or āgama i.e. the three-fold path of śravaṇa, manana and nididhyāsana, in order to escape from reason and its nescience into the true jñāna or paraavidya of the bhagavadānubhava (beatific vision). The place of the guru or ācārya is also crucial. Reason does not lead to truth, for it remains in the realm of subject-object dualism - the world of avidya.

Where the Enlightenment went wrong is probably in its assumption that traditionless perception is possible - even in knowing the world of avidya. Romanticism on the other hand sees tradition as the antithesis to reason, and sees it as part of the given - as part of nature itself.

^{Hans Georg}
Hans-George Gadamer has shown us a middle way - by proposing that understanding or perception of reality is "the interplay of the movement of tradition and the movement of the interpreter"³. But he goes on to say that all understanding involves an anticipatory element, an expectation awaiting confirmation, a fore-conception of completion as he calls it. There is that element of a guessed or anticipated meaning in your listening to a sentence or reading it. At least half way through hearing or reading the sentence, you half guess how it would end up; otherwise one cannot listen to that first half.

3. op cit. p. 251.

Another important principle of Gadamer's is that " true historical thinking must take account of its own historicity"⁴ History is not just in the object of understanding, but also in the subject. The subject has a particular 'horizon' within which alone he can understand, though in the very process of understanding this horizon changes or expands.

And the understander's or interpreter's horizon is determined by his or her own historicity, or his or her wirkungsgeschichte. One sees both past and present as well as future only in terms of one's own location in history, the experiences one has had as an individual, as a particular family member, as a member of a particular society, as a citizen of a particular nation at particular time, as a member of the human species, as a product of the evolution of the whole cosmos.

We will stop this methodological probing by simply stating that in elucidating our anticipation of our future, we must be conscious of the role that the elucidator's own historical locus or wirkungsgeschichte and horizon play in the content of that elucidation.

II The Future as Scenario

We can look at three or four scenarios of the future, from different perspectives - one a contemporary West European liberal and the other a contemporary East European Socialist as also a Chinese horizon and then try to find our own way from our own place of standing .

A. The World Market Economy Scenario

Any prognostication of the future on the part of western liberals has to take into account the four diseases of the economy which have^{ve} been diagnosed:

1) Stagnant Production : The growth of the economy has slowed down. The growth rate of all western(developed) economies together in this decade shows the following trend:

1980	-	+ 1.2 %
1981	-	+ 1.2 %
1982	-	- 0.5 %
1983	-	+ 0.5 %

These seems to be little prospect of the growth rate going up even to 1 % per year.

2) Growing Unemployment : again the figures are eloquent. Unemployed in

1980	-	21 million
1981	-	25 million
1982	-	30 million
1983	-	34 million

3) Shrinking World Trade. Here are the figures for the World Economy's annual percentage increase or decrease in trade & commerce

1980	-	+ 1 %
1981	-	0 %
1982	-	- 1 to - 2 %
1983	-	- 1 %

4) Growing Debt Burden of the Developing Countries

at the beginning of 1980	-	\$ 406 billion
do	1981	- \$ 465 billion
do	1982	- \$ 530 billion
do	1983	- \$ 626 billion
do	1985	- nearly \$ 1000 billion.

These are the four diseases perceived by the economist which are sufficient to account for the pessimism that exists in the west. Add to it the factors of a deteriorating environment, a growing insecurity and fear of nuclear catastrophe, and an anticipation of collapse in the world economy. Add again the unhealthy monetary and economic cut-throatism among the leading market economy countries in their panic about survival - e.g. Japan, U.S.A. & Western Europe at each other's throats.

Where is the ray of hope for these developed industrial countries ? Only one - namely a world war which would change the alignment of forces and eliminate the danger of socialism as well as weaken some of the other leading market economy countries. If a war between USA and USSR can be fought outside Europe, Western Europe stands to gain, and if it also results in the defeat of Socialism Eastern Europe would join Western Europe and they can, as a United Europe, once again recover world domination. If the war can be fought in Europe and socialism can be defeated the Soviet and European competition would be eliminated for the moment and the U.S.A. can dominate the world market. If Japan can also be drawn into the war, so much the better for the U.S.A.

And in case there is no major war - all out nuclear war is clearly unriskable - there are two possibilities - (a) whoever captures the arms market will control the whole market. So all industrially developed countries are concentrating on arms manufacture and trade (b) keep on spending on the armaments race, and occasionally foment little local wars with-out involving the major powers; then this arms production and trade will keep the economy going; and also stimulate technological development (e.g. electronics, communication, espionage) and the technology market will supplement the arms market. If possible capture also food technology and health technology because there are big market expansion possibilities here, as the population of the world grows.

And by keeping up the pressure on the arms race, the Soviet Union will find it economically impossible to catch up; their standard of living will not improve or catch up with the affluent of the industrially advanced market economies. This will lead to consumer unrest in the socialist countries, which can be skilfully used for the undermining of socialism,

Conted..... 13.

The whole thing is not particularly cheerful, but that is the best that Western Liberalism in a market economy framework can conceive or hope for.

Within this framework, there are a number of naive minorities which have several utopias - the greenie utopia of a low consumption, steady-state or no-growth or even industrially devolutionary society being the most prominent.

B. The Socialist/Communist Scenario

In the Socialist world, there are two scenarios - one used mainly for preaching (as in the case of Christians also) and the other more realistic.

The preached scenario goes like this. The inexorable laws of historical materialism will see through the collapse of capitalism, the triumph of socialism, and the transition from developed socialism to communism. This is assured. That transition has the following goal, as stated by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1961 already

"Communism is a classless social system with one form of public ownership of the means of production and full social equality of all members of society; under it, the all-round development of people will be accompanied by the growth of the productive forces through continuous progress in science and technology; all the springs of co-operative wealth will flow more abundantly, and the great principle 'from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs' will be implemented."

In communism, as distinct from socialism, according to this preaching, the individual will be different. His or her creative capacities would have flowered, and his or her labour infinitely more productive and interesting and satisfying.

The present pattern of division of labour will also change, and each person will contribute the best of his labour without constraint or regimentation. Also there will be a new motivation for labour, so that material incentives, such as are there in socialism, will no longer be necessary. High moral incentives will keep the society together without State Coercion. Labour will be performed, not for wages, but gratis, as a free contribution to society.

The key to all there is of course (a) the growth of the productive forces in socialist society through accelerated development of science and technology and (b) defending the socialist states and economies from subversion or aggression engineered by their enemies.

The socialist countries, especially those in the CMEA, have less than 10 % of the world's population, but do account for about 30 % of the world production of electricity, oil, natural gas, coal and steel. The unemployment rate in the CMEA countries is very low - almost negligible. As for residential facilities, the CMEA's 10 % world population has more residential flats than the 11 % of the world population in the U.S.A. plus EEC countries. Their growth rate has been fairly consistently about 2.2 % per annum, and the per capita income growth has been about 70 % from 1971 to 1982 compared with the 30 % of the EEC countries in the same period. The CMEA has much greater self-sufficiency in energy and raw materials (90-95 %). In health delivery the CMEA has an enviable record of achievement - most of them have more doctors and hospital beds per ten thousand than the USA, and medical treatment is almost free.

So Socialism is going forward, and unlike capitalism, is not in crisis. That is how it is presented or preached. And their projections of the future are all entirely optimistic.

Conted... 15.

In reality there are a number of problems. The first and the most important is not lack of personal freedom, but the high incidence of boredom, especially in the cities. Since there is basically no economic insecurity, the rat-race for making money and the tensions that result from it ^{are} and not so prevalent as in the market economy countries. But there is a general feeling that the western countries have a high standard of living, better consumer goods and more freedom to make money and enjoy life. This feeling creates a measure of restlessness especially among the elite. Work is not always easy to change or choose. From this comes a measure of boredom, despite large cultural possibilities. Alcoholism spreads in the wake of boredom, bringing production down.

The second most important problem is perhaps the mis-use of power by those in government and in the communist party-including a lot of petty bribery and corruption. From this comes about a growing disaffection for the government, the party and its ideology. This is a dangerous trend for the future of socialism.

The third, and perhaps even more important than the other two, is the growing pressure to spend on armaments, and also to ~~compete~~ compete for the world armaments market, where reactionary elements are being armed by the market economy countries. If the pressure on arms expenditure keeps up, it will be difficult to increase standards of living and to develop the forces of production adequately in order to build the communist future. Disarmament is a desperate need for the Socialist countries.

There is genuine fear of war and desire for peace, for the future of socialism and communism require spending less on armaments and not going to war.

The absence of certain personal freedoms is a fact in the socialist countries. There are restrictions on work and residence choices, on making money on night-clubs and gambling, on free travel, on holding meetings or public demonstrations on political or religious propaganda, on literary activity, on dissent and protest, on criticising party and government and so on. These

restrictions are justified as necessitated by social discipline in a situation of aggression, encirclement and infiltration by the forces of capitalism.

The basic Scenario, despite these problems about the future remains optimistic. At a less conscious level there is disquiet and uncertainty arising from a doubt about the full validity of the ideological preaching. The unpreached hope is that as the old guard of leadership changes, a younger crowd in their fifties will take over the leadership and move on to a more realistic blend of pragmatism and ideology. Perhaps not as radical and open as in the People's Republic of China.

C. The China Future Scenario

The mention of China leads us to a measure of speculation about the new wave of future anticipation in that great country of a billion people, who do not follow the CMEA line. For them today China and Chinese civilisation are more important than socialism or communism. They have a particular ideology of history which believes that both USSR and USA as well as Japan and Europe (and also India) are all doomed. The future belongs to China, if the four modernisations can be carried through without political upheaval. The mood, however, is one of basic optimism, leading through a major world ~~xxxx~~ war, to Chinese domination of the world.

B. The Indian Horizon

Shall we now come to our situation and look at our possibilities and our vision of the future of our nation and of the world. I can do this only from a personal perspective, severely conditioned by my limited horizon and my own untypical wirkungsgeschichte.

Let us look at the political situation first. Rajiv Gandhi has surprised all of us. I confess I told his mother less than two years ago that Rajiv will not be able to hold the country together. The evidence so far shows I was mistaken. There is thus the full possibility that I may be completely mistaken in everything I say about India's future too.

Rajiv himself is scared by the people's expectation (India Today Interview, Feb.15,1985). He has said so. But he is a good airline pilot, and sees his present job in those terms (Newsweek interview)

" Flying is really co-ordinating, monitoring a lot of different things happening while thinking of other things. In many ways it is similar if you imagine India as a huge aircraft, but with a much longer response time "

I cannot remember any time in my life when there was so much optimism - not even in the days of Nehru as Prime Minister. The important thing is that the optimism is broad-based, and not derived from any ~~xx~~ rhetoric, but from a basic intuition about the integrity, ability and political will of a politically inexperienced younger person.

We can't say yet that the incongruous and cumbersome aircraft which is India has taken off. Nor has the other aircraft - the Non-Aligned Movement, which is also piloted by Rajiv. But the engines are whirring. The motor is not dead. One does not know for sure whether the plane is air-worthy or has enough fuel and spare parts to make it go for a while.

Rajiv gives high priority to the abolition of poverty, but at the moment he, like Deng Hsiao Ping in China, is on a pragmatic line - clean up government, improve efficiency of production, take some hard decisions with a no-rhetoric soft sell, and solve problems where they can be solved. But the past is with us, limiting our possibilities of the future. For example:

- (a) Can the problems in the Punjab, Kashmir, and ^[Kashmir, etc.] Assam be solved at all ?
- (b) Can the undemocratic political process of election which costs Rs. 2 to 100 lakhs per candidate (with the implication that he who pays the piper calls the tune) be radically changed ?
- (c) Can the 50 % of our population who live below the poverty line find a means of living within our market economy system ?

I do not want to ^{say} ~~say~~ no, because I may be mistaken. But at the moment my optimism is heavily ~~fainted~~ ^{faded} with skepticism, on all three points.

Nature has been good to India the last three years. Bumper crops have saved our economy from total ~~kameness~~ ^{lameness}. In 1983-84 we produced a record crop of 151.5 million ton food-grains (beyond the target of 142 million) 1984-85 may not be as good as that, but the weather has not been too destructive, and we may reach target of 153.6 million if all goes well.

Growth rate has been high because of the bumper crops. Rajiv's policies may lead to a spurt in industrial production and therefore a substantial increase in the over all growth rate this year.

But agricultural growth rates for the future cannot be ~~expk~~ ^{extra} polated from the experience of the last two years. Sugar, Cotton & Jute production had already fallen during this same period. The same goes for steel production since 1981-82. Fertiliser production is also inadequate, and we still have to import 6 million tons at a cost of Rs.1200 crore.

Rajiv may be able to bring about some modernisation of industrial production equipment and also of the infrastructure. Cotton textiles may not do so well, but energy supply (coal, electricity and gas) may be better.

Inflation is unabated. In 1983-84 the over-all rate was about 8½ % and in the first half of 84-85 about 11 % per annum.

Foreign Trade deficit is also bad - Rs.5,951 crores in 1983-84, and Rs.5,868 crore in the year before that. Our imports are increasing, despite the rise in indigenous petroleum production. What offsets the picture somewhat is the continued flow of remittances by Indians abroad. The increase in rupee value of dollar works both ways. In 1985-86, repayment of the IMF loan (5 billion dollars) will begin to fall due. Debt servicing charges have already gone up from 8 % to 14 % of export earning.

Rajiv may be able to tone up some public sector undertakings. He will give more freedom and initiative to private industry. Savings rate, which is now a healthy 20 % has not been properly utilized in investments. Rajiv may improve things at this point. The black economy will need some hard decisions to curb. It has not yet begun to recede.

But the main problem - those of chronic unemployment, unabated poverty, and the growing gaping gap between the rich and the poor - these have not yet been tackled. Our total unemployment in the labour force is probably greater than all the developed market economy countries put together. Employment is a direct focal point in the seventh plan, but it is not yet clear how it is going to be tackled - beyond the Integrated Rural Development Programme and the National Rural Development Programme for which unbelievably tall claims have been made by the government.

Contd.... 20-

E. What kind of a Future Can We anticipate ?

Given this kind of a world, and the kind of effective history that I have, what kind of a future can I anticipate for the human race ?

My anticipation is very tentative, but based on the conviction that history always takes unexpected ^{turns} hours. I see the hand of God in these unanticipated ^{turns} hours - most recently the assassination of Mrs. Gandhi and the accession of Rajiv Gandhi to power in India.

Quite often the evil has to become quite ripe before the axe of God falls. It must fall, sooner or later. On the present oppressive-exploitative design of world power by which one-fourth of the world is affluent and three-fourth indigent, I expect an unexpected ^{turn} hour. I do not know whence it will come or when it will come. But my faith tells me it will come, and I pray for it.

One possible hopeful scenario is for disarmament negotiations to gain momentum and proceed expeditiously. Once war production becomes minimal, capitalism will take a big beating and socialism will take a giant leap forward as the standard of living in some European socialist countries goes up. Because my anticipation is such, working for peace and disarmament become a very high priority for me - of course to save the world from war and nuclear catastrophe, but also in order to promote greater social justice in the world.

The negative side of the same scenario is that the arms race goes on unabated, and before there is a nuclear war by accident somebody succeeds in a big bit of sabotage which causes something like the Bhopal tragedy and opens the eyes of the world to the consequences of a nuclear war. This is entirely conceivable and may be one path for history to take.

Contd..... 21.

The third and the most ^{g-ive}grosse Scenario is to have an actual nuclear war and the nuclear winter that would result from that. The consequences of this scenario shall be as follows, according to a consensus of scientists from East and West at the Moscow Round Table in 1985 on the consequences of a Nuclear War

"Until recently ~~was~~ strategists and military advisors have operated on the assumption that a nuclear war is containable, winnable and survivable.

But now, new research results both in the USSR and the USA confirmed by the research community world-wide, have completely changed our picture of what the disastrous effects of a nuclear war would be like.

What we had overlooked was the enormous impact on world-wide climatic conditions which would result from the smoke, soot and dust from large city and forest fires set off by nuclear explosions. We now know that these fires produce large quantities of smoke and soot which will fill the lower atmosphere. At the same time the upper atmosphere becomes loaded with fine particles of dust. This combination of high-altitude dust and lower altitude soot effectively blocks sunlight from reaching the surface of the earth, bringing about disastrous consequences to all living beings.

The first consequence almost immediately after the blast is that the earth's surface would become pitch-back. This would be equivalent to only about 1 % of the normal sunlight on a clear day. This is extremely dangerous for plant photosynthesis and would cause the death of a large variety of plants. The darkness will last for months and possibly much longer. Any humans who might have survived would face a future of starvation.

Conted.... 22.

Because of this intense darkness the temperature on the land surface drops to very low levels - in many areas to freezing conditions of less than minus 20° or more. The consequences are clear: many plants, animals and humans will freeze to death. In coastal areas, where water temperatures are higher, the climate may not be as severe but the differences in temperature between the land surface and the water will produce violent storms and blizzards.

Still another terrible effect is that the fires, in addition to their own destructive power, will generate huge clouds of toxic fumes which will shroud the land with a poisonous smog persisting for long periods of time.

In addition to darkness, freezing cold, and toxic gases the victims of a nuclear blast will be bombarded with radio-active particles not only immediately after the blast but for months on end. As a result of this the immune system of any human survivors would be so seriously damaged that, in addition to famine, people would face world-wide epidemics. Even if survival were possible for some time the damage to reproductive organs drastically reduces the possibility of giving birth to normal children.

When at last the darkness has cleared away and the sunlight returns to the earth, the damage to the ozone layer in the stratosphere will mean that the sunlight will have an abnormal amount of dangerous ultra-violet radiation for several years. This will have two major effects : it will drastically increase the rate of skin cancer and will affect the food chain by interfering with the pollination of plants through insects and by destroying marine plants in the upper ocean layer.

Another important aspect in this changing picture is that we now know that all of the phenomena which we have described will be world-wide. Scientific studies indicate that even subtropical and tropical normally warm areas will be subjected to severe frost, which, even if it lasts only for very short periods, will be sufficient to kill all vegetation. Though we once believed that there

Contd.... 23.

would be sanctuaries in the Southern Hemisphere to which a few people could flee, it is now clear that these effects will also be felt through the Southern Hemisphere - even though there may be a short delay.

The combined impact of these phenomena will be to destroy the life-support system of humanity throughout the world. But what is most shocking about all of this is the realization of how little of our present nuclear stockpiles it would take to unleash this horrifying scenario. In fact it would require less than 1 % of these stockpiles, an amount that could be fired off by only one or two modern nuclear submarines.

It would be admitted that there are uncertainties and unknowns. But the notion of Nuclear Winter is not a fantasy of the scientists. None of the present uncertainties are large enough to call into question the overall conclusions that have to be drawn from these findings, namely : in a Nuclear War there will be no winners even if the attacked nation does not retaliate. In a Nuclear Winter it is doubtful that there will be any survivors. But unlike the normal winter and seasons which are parts of the cycle which gives us life, Nuclear Winter is not inevitable but the result of human decision. Therefore, all of us who want to be survivors must use all our energy to make sure that a Nuclear Winter never sets in."

We cannot afford the third horrible scenario. The human spirit assisted by the spirit of God must eliminate the possibility of this scenario. There is no way except to ban all nuclear weapons and to keep space free ~~ix~~ from all weapons.

(Dr. Paul Gregorios)

Solar energy is plentiful in India. No one has as yet taken a monopoly on it. There is no tendency even to hoard it for profiteering, at least in India today.

But solar electricity is certainly not cheap. Our hydel projects and our hydro-carbon burning electricity projects are all inefficient, and therefore incredibly high in production costs and seldom reliable. But can solar electricity compete in the market with hydro-electric or hydro-carbon electric power ? Certainly not now.

Non-electrical use of solar energy seems more suited to air and water heating purposes, but this is a priority only in cooler climates than ours. Of course some of our ITDC hotels and other establishments can certainly use solar energy in larger quantities for air and water heating and I am glad that the Qutab Hotel has already done some pioneering in this regard. Maintenance problems will hit even Qutab in due course if they have not already done so. But we may, let us hope, learn to overcome these. It may also have some potential in industry where sub-sixty temperatures are needed for air or water.

The question today is, however, how to make solar or any other form of energy available to the poor ? I have no panacea for solving this problem. But I do have a few convictions that I would like to share.

1. The Priority of Wood Energy. I would submit that, planning on the national scale in India today should give a higher priority to wood fuel than to solar energy, if the needs of the poor are to receive due consideration. This does not call for any great technological innovations, and for that reason it may not appeal to the planners. If there was one thing on which Sanjay Gandhi was right, that was about the need to plant more trees. It is all right to talk about Solar and Bio-mass, but neither of these is very likely to come within the practicality and affordability range of the poor man, at least until solar photo-voltaic technology comes cheap to the market.

What prevents solar from so coming is a good question, that needs to be answered. But in the immediate future wood energy in plentiful supply at economic rates seems to be the best way to meet the needs of the poor.

The World Bank Report on Renewable Energy Sources in the Developing Countries (Jan, 1981) cites a review which states that "about 50 million hectares of trees would need to be planted in the developing countries between now and the year 2000, to satisfy the projected demand for fuelwood for cooking and heating in the year 2000". (p.24). This means a five-fold increase in present tree-planting rates - and in some areas like Africa a fifteen-fold increase. The World Bank thinks that this particular review is understanding the problem, being too optimistic about alternate forms of energy like biogas and kerosene becoming usable. The World Bank says then that it is planning only \$ 425 million loans for wood for the 5 year period 1981-85, which obviously will not meet the need - even if wood stoves become much more efficient and charcoal production techniques are improved.

The Bank estimated (in 1980) that they would have to increase their lending to more than twice their present plans, i.e. to lend \$ 1100 m for the 5 years 81-85, if the target is planting trees on one million hectares of land over that period. And the review estimates the need as fifty million hectares in 15 years !

But firewood prices are already sky-rocketing in India, and the poor certainly cannot afford to buy firewood at present market rates. Eric P. Eckholm, in his articles on "The Other Energy Crisis: Firewood" in Energy in the Developing World: The Real Energy Crisis^x tells us in West Africa (Niger and Upper Volta) firewood takes 20% to 30% of the average family's income - at least those families which can afford to buy any firewood at all. In Pakistan, poor people strip the bark off the trees that line the roads. Poaching for firewood is on the increase everywhere.

x Vaclav Smil and William E. Knowland (eds),
Oxford University Press, 1980

For too many poor people in India, dung patties, the only available alternative to wood fuel, are also becoming increasingly beyond their reach; even if they were within reach, cowdung is rich fertilizer, and it is a huge waste of its plant nutrients to burn it as fuel. The estimate is that 300 to 400 million tonnes of wet dung is dried to give 60 to 80 million tons of dry dung patties. Perhaps the fertilizer so wasted is about a third of our present chemical fertilizer production ! The only solution is to plant more trees so that cowdung is returned to the soil - as nutrient and not as ash.

Excessive use of bio-gas can also be an unusual strain on the cowdung cycle, which has to be maintained for the fertility of rural land.

2. The Economic of Solar Energy.

There are very few forms in which direct solar energy can be used on a small scale, with collector focussing. The solar cooker is still a curiosity in India. They say you can make one for Rs 100 to Rs 350/-. And that is, even if it were true, more than what many poor can afford. Besides, for families where the cooking has to be done in the evening after the bread winners return from wage labour, solar cookers are no use any way. And maintenance is also more of a headache than what many poor homes can manage.

The economics of solar energy for the poor, however, is more than merely a matter of cost and maintenance. Is solar energy likely, in the near future, to help the poor at all ? If direct solar is to be used mainly for water and space heating, the Indian poor would not be interested. If cookers cannot be used when the sun is not shining, they are also going to be of little use to the poor. Photovoltaic conversion also seems now beyond their budgets. Despite all claims that photovoltaic costs have been or are being drastically reduced, in most cases solar energy, supposed to be free, remains more expensive than many traditional technologies.

In the over-all economics of solar energy the only major factor is its renewable character. The supply is unlikely to run out. There will be no scarcity of the energy source itself.

Even for the privileged 40 % of our country above the poverty line, solar energy seems to have mainly ecological-educational value. In some of our northern climates, they may have some value for room and water heating purposes; but as far as I know, no simple technology has been developed for keeping a house air-conditioned - cool in hot weather and warm in cold weather. Middle class people do use hot water throughout the year, but solar heaters are still too technologically inelegant and economically unattractive.

Commercial use of solar energy also does not seem to offer much attraction. Of course solar energy is good for drying grains, fruits, vegetables meat and fish, tobacco leaves etc; but whether they compare economically with alternate energies is still doubtful. Solar energy may be useful in places where electric energy is as yet unavailable, but this is only a short-term use.

3. Is Solar Energy worth the effort ?

These observations lead to the question whether it is necessary or wise for the Government of India to invest large amounts today in Solar Energy research. I myself used to argue that if we had put the money and effort we have put since 1947 into nuclear energy, we might very well have been ahead of others in solar technologies. I do not so argue now. Our nuclear energy programme has been severely handicapped not only by factors of international politics, but also of infrastructure and of efficiency in management. Would our solar energy research programme have fared better ? I doubt it.

Only on photovoltaic conversion technology I still retain a measure of hope that significant breakthroughs can be made. With the use of non-crystalline or amorphous silicon, costs may be considerably reduced; but we still see little chance of a reduction in flat-plate or reflector area. If it is going to continue to take about two square meters

I am told that the market price of PV cells has fallen, from about \$ 100/- per peak watt (under optimum conditions) in 1970, to about \$ 10/- by 1980. There is expectation of similar dramatic reductions in this decade, but I am not sure that those calculations have taken all the relevant factors into consideration.

The World Bank judgement in 1980 was that PV power will cost not less than 55 cents US^x per kilowatt hour under optimum conditions. Small conventional generators now produce dependable electricity at about 45 U.S cents per Kwh., and in the U.S.A. diesel generator power costs about 18 cents per kwh or less. These prices will keep going up, but the same factors will also affect PV power. It is unrealistic to hope that PV can compete in the market with hydropower or oil power at least for some years to come.

4. Is Solar Energy ecologically problemless ?

The usual argument for solar is in terms of two environmental factors of great importance - depletion of resources and pollution of ecosphere. It is clear, however, that the harnessing of solar power requires the use of finite or non-renewable sources like collector materials or silicon. When solar power is used on massive scales, it may give rise to new shortage problems in non-renewable resources. Though not as serious as oil and gas depletion, it is still a problem, and the assumption that solar energy solves the problem of finite non-renewable energy sources may be pre-mature. The idea of earth-orbiting sun-tracking solar collectors with micro-wave transmission to earth stations remains still only an idea, but if it becomes realised, it may create quite considerable environmental problems.

x. At present the costs under optimum conditions averages about \$ 2.00 per kwh.

But even if the comparatively harmless earth-based collectors are used, as the scale increases, we may find that it does create environmental problems of an unanticipated kind. It is naive to assume, before sufficient experience, that solar energy is ecologically problemless

5. Conclusion

There are certain specific areas in which solar energy can be used, but I have the feeling that some of these areas are not priority areas for India today. I shall try to list some of the areas where solar could be used, also in India, hoping that others would add to the list.

1. In certain remote areas, like unelectrified villages, solar powered generators and solar distillers, could both be useful, if maintenance problems can be handled;
2. For telecommunications repeater stations, satellites, rockets, navigational buoys and beacons, remote monitoring equipment, etc.
3. For solar flat-plate driers - fruit, tobacco, fish, grains, timber, meats and vegetables, in situations where natural solar drying is hindered.
4. For more efficient greenhouses in cold climates
5. For space and water heating in cold and temperate climates
6. For low head photovoltaic water pumps for irrigation etc.
7. For solar cookers, refrigeration, and similar domestic appliances under certain conditions (camping outdoors, on ships etc)
8. For sub sixty temperature industrial use, where needed.

As far as we can see now, it will be unrealistic for our nation, in the light of the above facts to put anything more than a moderate amount of interest and money into solar energy. That moderate amount should however be soon forthcoming.

The main thing for us to watch is how we keep up with photo-voltaic technology that is changing every week. If we get into long-term contracts for technology which can become obsolete before the ink dries on the signed contract, we will be in trouble. Western industries will be jealously guarding the more viable technologies, and unless our own research institutions are run with greater efficiency and sincere enthusiasm, we will be at the mercy of the most exploitative and unfavourable terms for transfer of solar or P.V. technology. Here it is a question of more than money. What matters is efficient management of research and the combination of integrity with enthusiasm and creativity.

The west is excited about solar energy - for two reasons. First, there is a "myth of the solar", which they want to believe will redeem them from all their energy, resource depletion and environmental problems. In what seems to be a very dark future, "solar" means the light of hope. So let it be. The myth seems extremely unrealistic. The second reason is slightly sinister. In a world where market economy capitalism seems to be foundering on the rock of an unreceding recession, the economy as a whole is desperately looking for new markets. The main possibilities now seem to be armaments, information technology and alternative energies. We should beware that we are not taken in by the myth of the solar, which may help mostly the greedy appetites of the profit-makers, while the poor will continue to languish in their misery.

TAKE A LOOK AT OUR WORLD

**A partial perception of some aspects
of the world today**

Key Note Address at the YMCA World
Council, Buenos Aires, Argentina June
29—July 6, 1977

When some months ago the World Alliance of YMCAs asked me to present a "World Overview" at the 1977 YMCA world Council, the hope that I would be able to summarize and clarify for myself my own present understanding of world reality led me to accept the invitation, almost gladly. But as I sat down to put my thoughts to writing, I found that it would take several hours of presentation to do anything like justice to my task. This is not, therefore, a World Overview. It is a mere glance — a partial perception of some of its realities.

In the English language, partial can mean either "relating to one part" or "one-sided". This presentation is intentionally both. Only a few aspects of world reality are treated. And that from a definite perspective — namely that of the suffering section of humanity, with a commitment to the cause of the victims of injustice in the world today.

"Enlisted in Reconciliation" is the theme for this World Council. It is a Christian theme,

taken directly out of St. Paul's writings (II Cor. 5:18). And yet, out of its context, it can be misleading. Did Jesus seek to reconcile the Roman Government and the Jewish leadership? Did he seek to reconcile the Scribes and Pharisees with the Jewish people? If he did, he would not have used such terms as "Go, tell that fox" about the Roman Ruler or "Woe unto you, hypocrites" to the Scribes and Pharisees. Not all reconciliation is necessarily Christian. Where there is injustice, one cannot simply reconcile the oppressor and the oppressed, before the injustice is removed. That is why quite often only struggle can lead to peace, why quite often cooperation is possible only after there has been a confrontation.

For that is the way the world is. An arena where good and evil confront each other. confront us. The Christian teaching is that history is a field where the wheat and the tares grow together, and can be finally separated only at the last time. But at the last time, good and evil are not reconciled to each other. The wheat is gathered together into the barns, the tares are burned in the fire. Thus it is not reconciliation that finally overcomes evil, but judgement and destruction.

Often Christians are afraid of the theme of judgement in the Biblical message. The Day of the Lord is always a day of mercy and redemption to the victims of oppression, as well as a day of doom to the oppressor. In taking a look at this world of ours, we shall keep both themes in mind — judgement and reconciliation.

The ultimate destiny of reality is what our Lord prayed for — That All May Be One. Taking all the first letters of that theme you get the word TAMBO. But let us not forget that we have to add one more letter — for the One who prayed for TAMBO, Christ; for the Way to

TAMBO, the Cross; for our own role as adopted sons and daughters of God, actors in the drama that ends up in TAMBO. If you add the letter C (for Christ, for the Cross, for the Church, for Christians, for Compassion, for Concern, for Conviction and Commitment, which are all necessary for the reconciliation that leads to TAMBO), and rearrange the letters of TAMBO, you get COMBAT, and that is a word which we as Christians should take seriously in a world where evil is forceful and regnant, (My apologies to listeners of Spanish and other languages — the TAMBO — COMBAT point cannot be easily translated.) We must clarify our vision, to recognize the presence of evil in us, outside us, in persons, in societies, and find ways and means of combatting that evil by the methods of the Cross. Our World Overview must therefore be concerned about the YMCA's own role in this Combat as well as in Reconciliation.

I. Perception of the Universe — Some Philosophical and Theological Considerations.

We are part of the universe. We cannot stand above it to get a bird's-eye view. We can transcend it in our minds. But never completely. For our minds are also conditioned by many limits.

(a) Our five senses are not equipped to take in all the data in the universe. A dog sees and hears different things which we don't see or hear. There are radio waves in this room which our sense-equipment does not pick up, but an ordinary radio can pick up and transmit to our ears as sound waves. In fact, with all our sophisticated scientific equipment and technology, we have access only to a very tiny segment of the spectrum of reality. We see reality only "as through a glass, darkly".

(b) Our culture limits our perception. Our ways of looking at and understanding reality is severely conditioned by our cultural traditions,

linguistic habits, our educational system by our historical experiences, by our geographical location, by our science and technology, by our religious heritage, and so on.

(c) Our perception is also limited by our interests. We perceive more readily what is useful to us. If there is a gold coin and a piece of tin lying on the floor, we are more likely to perceive the gold rather than the tin. If making money is our main interest, then we will readily perceive the easier ways of gaining profit, and our admiration will be for those who are making piles of money. If power is our main interest, the powerful and their acts will be the ready objects of our perception. If you are a capitalist, you are likely to see more easily the obstacles to the development of capital and profit, rather than the problems faced by the poor. Our interest determines our perception and we cannot see some things in the world, because to see them in their true light would demand some difficult and radical changes in our own attitudes and actions. My perception of the world may not agree in all respects with yours, for my cultural tradition as well as my interests may not be the same as those of some of you.

The basic structure

We can see the universe as composed of inter-related objects in space, beginning with the galaxies of space coming to our own star, the sun, and our own planet, the earth, and our own continent, country, town, village, home, etc. This is the spatial view of the universe — the universe of physical scientists for the last several centuries.

More recently, especially as a result of the Hegelian philosophical tradition, we have come to see the universe, not as a series of objects, but as a series of inter-locking events. Each event is a unit of reality related to both past and future events. The event is the stage

in which the objects and persons play out the drama, and all events together constitute a process. This view has been popularized by thinkers like Bergson, Whitehead and Teilhard de Chardin. We will call it the temporal view of the universe. Historical understanding and Process Philosophy prefer this framework for looking at the universe. This is the view today of the social sciences.

A Christian view must take into account the views of both the physical sciences and the social sciences. But that is not sufficient. In certain circles of western thought, there is growing up a new framework, which comes closer to the Christian understanding of reality. And this framework is of primary significance. Most of our world analyses, while sophisticated and complex within their own framework, show the limits of the framework which does not allow all the data being taken into account.

This new framework is provided by a confluence of several fields of new biological research. Prof. Burr of Yale was one of the early pioneers, much misunderstood by his contemporaries, of the line that life itself was a field of forces * an interdependent system of force-fields. Many of these forces we do not as yet know very much about, but have evidence enough to suspect that they are impinging upon us.

A human being is not simply put together with three components called body, mind and spirit, but is himself or herself a force-field which inter-acts with other force-fields. But so are animals, plants, all living things. The development of Kirlian photography in the Soviet-Union and ongoing research in what they call 'Bioplasmic Energy' in the Soviet-Union, has made it possible to perceive that

* Burr, *The Fields of Life*

there is in each living being a field of energy which grows and develops and changes in inter-action with other force-fields in the universe. The genes and chromosomes direct this energy in a particular direction of growth, but not the only determinant. The whole environment, with various known and unknown force-fields, inter-acts with the force-field of each unit in it. These force-field and their mutual interaction are not completely predetermined. The forces which we call consciousness and will are also components of this system of inter-action of force-fields.

It is very important to get this perception right, because it provides a more comprehensive framework for our 'World Overview'. I cannot go into detail here, but proceed from this to a Christian theological perspective which helps us to see the world from the perspective of the faith.

II. A Christian Perception of the World Reality

Again one goes into short-hand to provide the rough outline of this Christian perception of reality. We posit the following basic force-fields which constitute reality.

1. The uncreated force-field which we Christians call the Triune God

This is the fundamental reality from which all created reality flows and on which everything else is dependent. We say that it is God Who, without Himself being caused, is the cause and ground of all. He not only 'called' the creation into being from non-being; He directs its movement forward to its fulfilment, gives the energy for that forward movement, and takes the universe to its goal. Without the guiding and sustaining force-field of the *energeia* of God, nothing can exist, and all that exists will go back to nothing when it falls outside

this force-field of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit,

2. The created force-field of the process of creation and its evolution

This is the realm where our science explores the reality and its inter-relationships. Science is also a growing and changing body of knowledge. No philosopher of science worth his salt can today say that it is a body of proved knowledge. All they can say is that this body of knowledge stands up fairly well to certain reality tests and are therefore helpful for our understanding of that reality and for the development of a technology that allows us to control, transform, manipulate and use that reality for our own purposes. Science does not reveal to us the whole of reality. It helps us to uncover certain hidden aspects of the inter-relation between various sub-fields of energy, (matter and life in there various manifestations). Matter, too, is a field of energy, we know now. So is life, as also consciousness and will.

3. The subsidiary force-field created by human purpose, will and action.

As it expresses itself in person and community, in society and history. This human creation is the area where freedom, which is God-bestowed in creation, most clearly manifests itself, at least from our own perspective. The human mind or consciousness and will, which is itself more than just the activity of the brain, cannot be located in any part of the human body. It is an aspect of the force-field that constitutes us as human beings, and has its own freedom, within limits, to choose, to understand, to will, to image, to create, to transform. It is an important concern of Christians that all humanity is able to develop to the full this freedom. But it can be developed only when that which stands in its way is removed.

4. The created force-field or anti-force, generated by created being in its freedom, the anti-force of non-being, non-truth, non-love, non-wisdom, non-freedom, which we call evil.

This force of evil, generated in freedom by the creation itself, contradicts and seeks to countervail the power of being and the good given to the creation by its Creator. This force-field is operative, Christians believe, not only in each human being; it is operative also in the institutions and structures of society; it works even in organic and inorganic matter, for we see that everything in creation is subject to non-being, driving everything towards disintegration, decay and death. This universe now open to our senses is subject to death and decay. It is not permanent. If it is to endure, it has to be different, not subject to Carnot's Second Law of Thermodynamics, which states that all things are energy-fields giving out the finite amount of energy contained in them and moving towards the "stable equilibrium" of death and inert non-being. St. Paul says the same thing in Romans 8:21, when he says that the creation itself shall be liberated from the slavery to decay and share in the glorious freedom of the children of God.

We would be making a big mistake in our World Overview if we assumed that it is in this world of time as we now experience it that evil shall be finally overcome. The ultimate overcoming of evil demands a reconstitution of our world at all levels. Matter itself will have to be reconstituted in the New Heaven and the New Earth, so that it no longer obeys Carnot's Second Law, but is able to endure for ever as a non-disintegrating force-field.

We must also not make the other mistake in our World Overview that because in history the good will always be mixed with evil, therefore we can do nothing about it. Our business in history is to carry on the struggle against evil, to overcome evil by the good.

5. The force-field of the Incarnate, Crucified and Risen Christ

The final overcoming of evil is, however, assured. It is assured because Christ is risen. Death, who ruled asking in our little world, has been overcome. He has lost his universal triumph. "Where, o death, is Thy victory?" "Death is swallowed up in victory" (1 Cor. 15: 54) when Christ tasted death and broke its fetters by rising from the dead. The power of the Risen Christ is the place where we see the uncreated force-field of the Triune God, and the created force-field of the human energy come together into an ineffable union for the redemption of this death-bound universe. This new force-field of the Incarnate Christ is also operative in our world, redeeming it, saving it, taking it from death to life, from evil to good, from non-being to being. We Christians are privileged to be conscious of the mystery of the Incarnate Christ's presence in the world, and are (ought to be) ourselves manifestations of that Incarnate Presence. This is the new dispensation of the Holy Spirit, where the life-giving, form-creating, liberating, personal power of God operates through a new divine-human community called the Church. Despite all her failures, despite all her atrocious betrayals of her Lord, despite all her lethargy and indifference, despite all her desire for power and glory, for comfort and popularity, she continues, in a mysterious way, to be the bearer of the redeeming power of Christ. Without any civil or economic power, or despite her misuse of civil and economic power, she is a force-field in which the power of the incarnate, crucified, risen and ascended Christ, the power of the new economy of the Spirit, operates in a mysterious way to bring the creation to its fulfillment and destiny. The mystery is in the ineffable way in which both the uncreated divine and created human force-fields work together in a synergism which we believe but cannot understand.

6. The created force-fields of the cosmic powers

Our faith affirms that the drama of history is larger than the stage of history that we can see with our senses. The author of Ephesians tells us of powers and forces "in the heavens" (3:10) who are involved, negatively and positively, in our historical struggle. As the Jerusalem English Bible puts it: "The sovereignties and powers should learn, only now, through the Church, how comprehensive God's wisdom really is, exactly according to the plan which he had had from all eternity in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Eph. 3:10-11). On the one hand, "it is not against human enemies that we have to struggle, but against the sovereignties and the powers who originate darkness in this world, the spiritual army of evil in the heavens" (Eph. 6:12). On the other hand, the heavenly 'cloud of witnesses on every side of us, invisible but operative, are engaged with us in the same struggle of good and evil, between being and non-being, between life and death. Christians can subscribe to no world overview that disregards or overlooks this dimension of the process of the universe.

This, I submit, is the hasty sketch of the framework within which we must view the world, neither a three-storey framework of hell, earth and heaven, nor a secular framework which takes history as self-contained, self-generating and autonomous. All six aspects are important.

III. The World of History Today

I don't know how many of you were able to orbit with me in the universe in my flight into cosmic space for our World Overview. I am splashing down, landing in the sea of current history. Can you come with me for a quick glance at our earthly, historical world, the hard realities which you all know so well. I shall be brief, and touch on the four poles of that earthly historical reality today. Not that

I believe in the first, second, third and fourth worlds of which people frequently speak. But they are groupings which have much in common:

(a) The first for me, in degree of commitment, because of my own historical situation, is the world of the poor millions. They are the majority of humanity—the poor people of the non-oil exporting countries of Asia, Africa, Latin America, the Caribbean and the Pacific and other islands.

(b) Then there are the people of the socialist countries—of China and the Soviet Union, of North Korea and Vietnam, of Laos and Kampuchea, of Angola, and Guinea-Bissau, of Cuba, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania, Albania, D.D.R., Yugoslavia and perhaps Tanzania, Mongolia and others. They are not all equally poor. But they have chosen a path which somehow threatens some and fascinates others, the path of socialist development. The YMCA cannot work in these countries. But they are also people, and their welfare is of concern to us.

(c) Then there are the peoples of the oil-exporting but industrially less developed countries—Venezuela, the United Arab Emirates, Iran, Iraq, Indonesia, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, and other countries. A very large part of these people are Muslims, and we Christians have to make an effort to identify ourselves with them as human beings.

(d) Finally, there are the richer industrially developed countries following the market economy system of development. The U.S.A. is at the head of this group, with West Germany and Japan as seconds-in-command. They are now-a-days referred to as the North. But some of their members are south of the equator, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand.

Now some people, in their overview of the world, tend to see the polarization as North-South or Rich and Poor. Such terminology helps only to obscure the reality. The difference between Cuba and Chile is not between the rich and the poor, or North and South.

Let us stick to the four-fold classification of peoples—non-oil sub-industrialised, oil-exporting sub-industrialized, socialist sub-industrialized and industrialized. The lines of demarcation are not always so clear. For example India is the eighth largest industrial producer of the world, but I will put her in the first category, for she has still not begun to resolve her problems of poverty and employment despite a high degree of industrialization.

These four groups are sufficiently homogeneous, however, to permit us to regard each group as a corporate force-field, increasingly recognizing their common interest (despite internal competition) and often in confrontation with each other.

We should first take into account the fact that most of YMCA activity is in zone 1—non-oil sub-industrialized countries and in zone 4—the market economy industrialized. In fact many people regard the YMCA as an arm of the industrialized market economy countries and their economic and cultural interests operating in the sub-industrialized non-socialist world. For many of our leaders, the YMCA appears like a link between the middle-class interests in our country with similar interests in the industrialized capitalist countries. This impression is reinforced by the obscured fact that the YMCA seldom organizes a programme of action which can be regarded as revolutionary or radical. There are very few among the local YMCA leadership who would be regarded as exceptionally progressive. They are generally defenders of the status quo in most countries.

How much attention has the YMCA paid to the central fact of our time—the growing gap, despite great industrial progress, between the rich and the poor? Statistics can do no justice to the dimensions of the problem. But it is a fact that during the 20 years from 1952 to 1972 the total product of the developed market economy countries grew from \$ 1250 billion to \$ 3,070 billion, (i.e. by more than 145 percent). Their per capita income grew from \$ 2,000 a year to \$ 4,000 a year. The gap previously between the rich and the poor was \$ 1,825 in 1952. In 1972 it was \$ 3,700. That is, with the doubling of income in the rich countries, the gap between the rich and the poor has more than doubled. though poor countries' per capita income grew from \$ 175 per annum to \$ 300.

Remember that the figure of \$300 per annum is not yet realized for the millions of India and many other less developed countries. We in India are still staying at \$100 per annum. whereas some countries in Europe or America have gone up to \$ 6,000—the gap is thus 1 to 60.

Does the YMCA do anything to make young people aware of this problem? The YMCA has made development one of its priorities, and emphasizes the need for self-reliance and self-determination. I am glad to hear that the YMCA in the U.S.A., through its International Division, has organized some 25 groups to study the international linkage of economic problems, to study the New International Economic order and the activities of the Trans-National Corporations. There are perhaps a few other efforts here and there. But can the YMCA effectively serve the young unless it gives central priority to the question of the growing inequality of distribution of wealth in international human society?

The tragedy of the thing is that there is no

strategy developed so far which gives hope of eventually narrowing the gap. All strategies, including that of the U.N. at present, have been seen to be inadequate. Where then is the hope that the young people of today can live tomorrow in hope? If the latest report that is before the U.N.—the Leontieff Report—is to be believed, what people call the New International Economic Order will not be able to reduce the gap.

How many years longer of frustration will it take before we all wake up to the fact that the existing economic system in three out of our four zones is doomed and cannot be repaired beyond a certain point? That it is built in such a way as to go on increasing the inequality and therefore the look for an alternate system in all the three zones must be accelerated with all deliberate speed? That the ritual of conferences and commissions and reports and bureaus are inadequate to find a lasting solution to the problem of injustice in our world? That unless radical international solutions are found, the per capita income of Non-oil Asia and Africa will be below \$500 a year even in 2000 A.D.? That the poor countries in the world are in debt already to the tune of a 100 billion dollars, that this debt burden is going to double in a few years, that there is no way to reduce this burden at present, that it will go on growing at the rate of 10 to 14% every year?

How long will it be before we realize that

(A) we have to shift from a market economy system to a system where ownership of the means of production and decision-making on production and distribution rests with the people if justice is to be ensured both within and between nations?

(B) the proposed New International Economic Order is a false help before our eyes to make

us believe that the problems will eventually be resolved?

(C) without a New International Political Order, a New International Economic Order cannot be implemented effectively?

But what can the YMCA do to face this enormous problem facing humanity? The question needs to be tackled here. Youth has already become radicalized. If the YMCA still continues to be a middle-class bourgeois organization, it will only alienate itself from the young people it wants to serve.

IV. The Poverty of Affluence

A second major problem that the YMCA should be seriously concerned about in its World Overview is the growing dissatisfaction that young people feel about the consumerist affluent society we have created. This is a problem not only for the industrialized fourth zone, but also equally for the first three zones.

We have proceeded, especially in the second half of this century, after the Second World War, with the assumption that having is being. We have measured our growth and development in terms of the quantum of goods and services each nation is able to produce and consume. We have classified the world into developed and under-developed in terms of the degree of industrialization, in terms of how many cars and TV sets each family has, in terms of the goods we can see in our shop-windows.

Such a view helps only the cause of the industrial capitalists and leaders who make more money and thereby acquire power over others. Even the socialist countries are reduced into compromising their own basic humanism by getting into the rat-race of producing and consuming. The rich capitalist countries taunt the socialist countries for not

having achieved their level of industrial production and consumerism. Without wanting to do so, the socialist states also are forced, both by public demand and by the pressure to compete with the capitalists, to follow the way of consumerism.

The countries of the Two-Thirds World, which belong to our first and third zones, also enter the rat-race. Even India, with all its high spiritual values and rich religious traditions, the search in Government planning is almost exclusively for a higher GNP. Growth is still measured in terms of Gross National Product, and growthism, or the desire to keep up with the Joneses, makes us slaves of this mighty machine of producing and consuming. We refuse to ask the question: What are the human values and qualities that we need to promote in the very process of producing more.

When the question is raised among intellectuals in India about human values and qualities, the answer is: let us first solve the problem of poverty, then in the second stage only we can afford to worry about values and qualities. The quest for quantity and the quest for quality are thus divorced and separated into two stages, and the planners devote all attention to the question of quantity, paying only lip service to quality.

The fact of the matter is that quantity of goods produced and quality of human life are not two separate stages. It is in the very process of producing more goods that we make irreversible decisions about quality of life. If acquisitive greed and pursuit of power and profit are the motives for work, then even if we achieve the level of prosperity prevailing in Sweden or U.S.A., we will be no better off as human beings. Social values are produced, not after we have produced and consumed enough, but in the very process of production and consumption.

Gandhi may have been right in saying that for the hungry God must appear in the form of food. But that is not the whole truth. Man does not live by bread alone, but he does live by bread or rice. The point is that the way we produce and distribute bread is itself shaping our beings, our personalities, our societies. Therefore, in some countries the first priority, is not economic growth, but the social education of the people, in order to liberate them from the greed and selfishness that makes society unjust. Their GNP may not be as high as in some others, but they have achieved some significant human progress with regard to unemployment, illiteracy, educational opportunities, a more equitable distribution of wealth, a greater hope and vigour among the people rather than fatalistic despair, a belief that they can act as people to solve their problems, rather than look to the state to solve all their problems for the poor. The most radical change needed is in the selfish attitudes of people, for it is when people learn to work and to cooperate, not each for his or her own personal benefit but rather for the common good, for the benefit of all, that they are able to solve their problems.

A country like Tanzania still faces many tremendous difficulties. It still has to grow in industry and agriculture to ensure a better level of fulfilling human needs. But it is moving strenuously in the direction of the right to employment and work, the right to have a roof over your heads, the right to free education and health services, the right to participate in social decision-making under the over-all national plan, the right not to be exploited by foreign or national business interests — these are basic human rights necessary for the dignity of man and woman.

These rights are not affirmed with the same effectiveness in countries of the First, Third and Fourth zones. And since most of us in

this world Council meeting come from these three zones, we should see what we can do to sharpen our own understanding of these problems!

V. Some Economic Issues which are Political

Due to limits of time, I will have to be aphoristic in my statements. These brief sentences are meant to promote discussion in the groups:

1. The problem of poverty, want and suffering in the countries of the first zone can be solved only by a disciplined effort of all the people, in an internationally coordinated way, based on the principles that (a) equity of distribution, (b) self-reliance based on the social ownership of property and social participation in decision-making, and (c) social motivations for work are necessary conditions for such a development.

2. The international trade system, the international monetary system, and the international banking system will have to be brought under democratic world control in order to ensure justice between nations. There is no provision for this in the proposed New International Economic Order of the United Nations. The N.I.E.O. operates within the World Market Economy System and seeks only to remove some of its most glaring contradictions, so that the system of oppression and exploitation can go on, to the benefit of the already rich.

3. In a capitalist economy, both nationally and internationally, those who own large amounts of capital, including the Trans-National Corporations, are able to produce more and accumulate more. The system therefore enhances injustice fundamentally, though some injustices are removed from time to time. The system needs overhaul. The N.I.E.O. is unable to do so. It is therefore a false hope.

4. The right of every able-bodied human being to socially useful labour, and the right of every human being to food, shelter, clothing, health services, education and communication, are the two fundamental human rights. It is wrong to give priority to the freedom of speech over the two fundamental freedoms — the right to work and employment, and the right to live a dignified human life with basic needs met. The other freedoms, the so-called democratic freedoms, are necessary, but they should generally be given only second priority. However, in some situations it may be a first priority to fight for freedom from torture, freedom from extra-legal arrest and detention, freedom from oppressive oligarchical control, because these freedoms are brutally suppressed there.

5. In terms of many local conflicts, we need to realize both their economic basis and their international ramifications. For example, in Southern Africa, the white minority oppresses the black majority for the sake of economic dominance and exploitation. In the Middle East, Israel, given a free hand, can quickly dominate the Arab countries economically. The fight in Lebanon is to be explained partly in terms of the Christian Maronites dominating the economy and exploiting the Muslims. In Northern Ireland, the Protestants dominate the economy and exploit the Catholics. Even in Uganda, it is a fact that the Christians dominate the economy and oppress the Muslims. In all these areas, the conflict of interest between western nations of zone 4 and the nations of zone 2 play a large part. We should always look to see which nations are on the side of the oppressed, and how they use their influence.

6. New hot-beds of conflict are emerging. The most important is the Indian Ocean and the Red Sea. This has to do with eventual control of the oil-producing areas, as well as

with military strategies for world domination. Israel, Iran and Southern Africa are also important keys to the control of the Indian Ocean and Red Sea. The new conflict is in the Horn of Africa between Somalia and Ethiopia. The naval-nuclear base in Diego Garcia as well as bases in Somalia and South Africa also fit into this pattern of Indian Ocean — Red Sea domination for the sake of ensuring oil flow into zone 4, and for the domination of the world by military-economic power.

7. The alliance between Industrial Wealth and Military Power is a major hazard for humanity. Without breaking this alliance the oppressive force of exploitation in the world cannot be finally tackled. The arms trade is the biggest new development in this situation of the growing grip of the military-industrial complex. This trade must be restrained by some ground rules agreed upon by the nations of the world.

8. Disarmament is a major issue towards the resolution of which the YMCA must devote considerable attention and effort. Today world defence expenditure is over 300 billion US dollars a year. This works out to more than 820 million dollars a day. We need a gigantic effort on a world scale to re-channel human energy and resources for peaceful uses. World public opinion has to be raised on a massive scale to bring about the necessary pressures on all governments. The issue is not merely that of possible nuclear destruction of the world. It is the gross and totally pointless waste of human effort, its economic aspects, its contributions to generating a military culture, and its contribution to the growth of injustice in the world that should engage world attention.

9. The nuclear energy issue becomes the focus of an impassioned controversy in Europe — particularly in Sweden, Holland, France, etc. We should understand the issues involved.

(a) There is a formidable shortage of energy to be foreseen if industrial development is to continue.

(b) Fossil fuels and hydro-electric power cannot supply this need.

(c) Alternate energy sources like solar power and wind and wave energy are not, with present technology, adequate to meet the need.

(d) Nuclear energy is a feasible alternative, but the risks involved are so immense that we have no right, with the present scope of our scientific technical knowledge, to proceed further with the building of nuclear reactors, until safer waste disposal techniques are discovered. We have no right to expose present and future generations to a totally insecure world as a consequence of

(i) risky disposal of highly unstable nuclear wastes;

(ii) the possible risks of leakage due to human error or negligence in the construction of reactors;

(iii) the hazards of hi-jacking of nuclear fuel and the risks of radio-activity to which people can be subject as a result of such hi-jacking;

(iv) the risks of using nuclear technology for destructive purposes by states, by terrorists, etc.

The debate has two aspects. First if you ask me: Is it a sin to exploit nuclear energy, I would answer with an emphatic no. All power is under Christ and given to man. Second, if you ask me, is it right in the present time-scale of our knowledge of science and technology, to go ahead with the large-scale building of nuclear reactors all over the world, I would again answer with a "no", in the light of the dimension of the four risks mentioned above.'

10. That leads to an important point—the direction and orientation of research. Money for research now comes partly from government and partly from the corporations. The corporations are primarily interested in quick and easy profit, and their research is only incidentally directed to human welfare. Government decisions on research allocations are also disproportionately oriented to military technology. Little money is available for research on solar energy or appropriate technology, or for developing patterns of social organisation which enhance rather than reduce the quality of human life.

11. On the Ecological Problem, the main issues are

- (a) regulation of population increase and distribution
- (b) economic regulation of resource and energy use
- (c) control of pollution
- (d) regulation of industrial development in order not to take the risk of upsetting the eco-balance or exposing future generations to the risk of radio-active contamination
- (e) the debate on the tension between sustainability and justice in the world.

12. On Trans National Corporations, the position is as follows. Their defenders argue that

- (a) they increase effectiveness in large-scale production necessary for development;
- (b) they facilitate the transfer of technology;
- (c) they create some employment in a world where large-scale unemployment is a major problem;
- (d) they make generous contributions to education, culture and research; and

- (e) they show the way, by transcending national frontiers, towards a future world of international economic organisation, towards a new international economic order.

Their critics argue

- (a) the kind of technology they bring is not suited to the real needs of a country, but are geared only to their quick profit; Zone one needs labour-intensive technology; TNC technology is counter-productive;
- (b) they concentrate not on essential goods like food, housing, clothing, transport etc. but on frivolous or luxury goods like beverages, toilet articles and automobiles;
- (c) they create oligopolistic patterns in pricing (e.g. drug prices);
- (d) they provide unfair competition to smaller local entrepreneurs and drive them out of business;
- (e) they evade control by national governments;
- (f) they bribe and corrupt national governments;
- (g) they use their tremendous economic power and international contacts to bolster up reactionary regimes and to subvert the efforts of progressive forces;
- (h) they gain control of the news media through advertisement funds, through subsidies, and through international news agencies which are themselves Trans National Corporations; by information control they exert undue power in societies;
- (i) they spread an unhealthy consumerist culture, becoming major instruments in a cultural imperialism which is part of the white western domination of the world (technological and organizational power is now concentrated in the white

western world and TNC's are an expression of that concentration).

VI. Direct YMCA Issues

I should like to conclude by raising some issues of direct importance to the YMCA.

1. How can resolute action be taken to ensure that people under 30 have a majority role in policy-making, in planning and execution of policy, and in local leadership in the YMCA? This is a high priority question. The YMCA cannot be revitalized unless the youth of the world comes to have a dominant role in YMCA affairs.

2. How can the YMCA foster not only personal growth in individuals, but also make young people see clearly that no genuine and just growth of persons can be achieved except through the commitment to the growth and development of society. How can YMCA programmes coordinate personal growth and social growth at the same time?

3. The YMCA, both on the world level and at the national level, must do a lot of fresh reflection on the question of its objectives and purpose. Does the YMCA still regard itself as a lay Christian movement, which through programmes of study, action and worship, seeks to extend the Kingdom of God in persons and societies? Or should it rather be a secular organization, a kind of youth club, professing some Christian values but in effect only another organisation for social service? It is of course less embarrassing not to make any religious claims, especially in our secular cultures. In a society like America, where the only significant non-Christian religion is the Jewish faith, Christians can open the leadership to all comers and still retain majority control. But what about Bangladesh or Japan, Turkey or Indonesia? It is clear that one single policy cannot hold for all these situations.

Besides, to be Christian means both identity and openness. In different situations we must look for ways of maintaining both identity and openness.

The issue, however, is not just whether we keep the C in YMCA. You may find a formula that will allow selective admission of non-Christians into the membership and leadership of the YMCA without losing your identity as a historically Christian organisation. But that is only part of the problem. The real question is, in what form shall the Christianness of the YMCA be expressed? Having a rule that Christians should have a majority in the policy-making bodies of the YMCA will not ensure the Christian character of the Y, because

- (a) it is always questionable as to how Christian these so-called Christians are;
- (b) even if the leadership is more than nominally Christian, the policy and programme of a Y may not be based on a deeper and truer understanding of Christianity.

In the first place, it needs to be said that to be Christian is to be open to all humanity. To be united with Christ is to share Christ's love and concern for all humanity—for Christians, Muslims, Jews, Hindus, Buddhists, Communists, Atheists—all "Who is my neighbour". Christ's answer in the parable of the Good Samaritan is: "Don't ask that question. Rather you be a neighbour to anyone whom you find in need, anywhere, under any circumstances."

On the other hand, the Christian has also a closure to the world outside. In the early centuries, on Sunday morning when the Christians assembled for prayer and Bible study, all were welcome to their meetings. No one would be refused entrance to the Church whatever his religious background. But then always a moment came, when the Christians

asked the others to leave, and only the baptized entered into a secret meeting with the Lord called the Eucharist, which the unbeliever could not attend but in which he could only be prayed for.

This rhythm of total openness to all and partial closure for the encounter with God in worship should continue to be the pattern of the work of the YMCA. Where that partial closure for worship is abandoned, secularization results and the C becomes inoperative.

It is possible for the YMCA in a country to take the decision to take the C out. This can be done in a country like the USA, or in a country where the Christian community is weak, like Turkey or Bangladesh. What would be the consequence? In both situations, this would virtually be a decision to discontinue the YMCA as an entity after a few years. It is the C that gives the identity to the YM. Once you take that out, the identity disappears, and then you merge with the whole. If Christian identity is important, then the C must remain, both in name and in the character of the operation. Identity and openness are both equally essential to being Christian. It is from the identity that the openness comes, not from a blank. Openness does not mean open like a meadow, but open like a door.

But the C must also become real. There must be something behind the door that is worth coming to. Otherwise people will attach no meaning to the adjective Christian. But how do we make sure that the Christian element in YMCA is more than in a name? Three elements can be proposed:

- (a) *intellectual clarification*—through discussion groups, using the best spiritual and intellectual resource persons in the community;
- (b) *worship services* — using a maximum of

meaningful symbolism, people's participation and with richness and depth of meaning;

- (c) *outstanding sacrificial service*—unusual forms of service demanding a high degree of dedication and sacrifice as well as love have to be created in each situation.

The combination of the three elements of work, worship and study alone can sustain Christianity in a community in the YMCA or elsewhere.

4. In multi-religious contexts, especially in Asia, YMCA will have to make a conscious effort to promote deep dialogue with other religions, in order to learn from ancient Asian wisdom. The churches of Asia are afraid to do so. They believe only in a one-way mission and will therefore continue to be ignored or despised by the intelligent people of other religions.

Buddhism, Hinduism, and Taoism have much to teach us, whether we are Asians, Africans, Latin Americans, Europeans, Americans, Aussralians or whatever else. The new discoveries in nuclear physics bring the insights of those religions very close to the scientific understanding of reality as an inter-connected system of force-fields, where individual units cannot be separated from each other.

The YMCA now has the image of being the agent of western culture to the rest of the world. Can this image be reversed? Can the YMCA facilitate the culture of the world being transmitted to Christians? This is a big challenge.

5. The YMCA now seems to be a middle-class institution. Its relation to the poor of the world is in terms of "social service" in the sense of doing something for them—a blind school, an institution for the mentally retard-

ed, a clinic in a slum etc. This has two defects —(a) it concentrates on the handicapped among the poor and leaves the vast majority of the poor untouched; (b) it does something "for" the poor, rather than making it possible for the poor to fight for their own liberation from the oppressive yoke. Most YMCA activities of this kind help only to reinforce the oppressive system by dressing the wounds of some of its victims. Can the YMCA undertake some radically new projects involving the structural evils of society, and in which the poor are the active participants in the struggle not merely passive recipients of help.

Learning from the poor is dangerous business. When their forces are mobilized with YMCA help; the forces of oppression will turn their guns on the YMCA. That is when you will need the C in your name.

Let us here in this World Council meeting look at the inter-play of force-fields, and see where the YMCA is lined up now, and where it should be. The force-field of the Incarnate Christ is also interacting with us. Let us be sensitive and be guided by it.

TURNING TO THE FUTURE

A quick look at our globe
today and tomorrow

Metropolitan Paulos Mar Gregorios

By way of a brief introduction to our Globalism II consultation in Prague, I wish to deal cursorily with four areas:

- I. Disarmament, Global Development and Global Common Security
- II. The Global Economic Crisis - Its Meaning and Significance
- III. The Developments in Global Science/Technology
- IV. New Thinking, Restructuring and Socialist Renewal

I. Disarmament, Global Development and Global Common Security

If all goes well, the epoch-making first step should be behind us by mid-December. The auguries are good for the signing of the first major treaty for the reduction of nuclear weapons. The Washington Summit meeting between President Ronald Reagan and General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev begins on December 9th. The intermediate-range and short-range nuclear weapons of the USA and the USSR will be totally eliminated if the treaty is signed. This applies to all ground-launched missile systems of the two leading nuclear powers - Perhings, Cruise Missiles, SS-4s, SS-12s, SS-20s and Pershing 1-As - everything ground-launched between 500 and 5000 km range. We hope that in less than a year from December 1987, the treaty will be ratified and implemented. The hope is that the 7a aging Pershing missiles owned by the USA and deployed in the FRG, would also be included.

All those intermediate and shorter range weapons together constitute about 4% of the total nuclear arsenals. Negotiations must advance for an agreement to scrap 50% of the strategic missiles also during 1988. There will still be enough left over - about 48% of present arsenals - to destroy our planet several times over. We cannot rest in security until all nuclear weapons of all nuclear powers are totally eliminated - including tactical or battlefield nuclear weapons; but the trend today is to strengthen the navies, that is, ships, aircraft-carriers and submarines with more and more nuclear weapons. The struggle for total elimination has therefore to be unrelenting. The time for peace movements to rest on our oars is still very far in the future. Especially as land-based nuclear weapons gradually yield place to water-based weapons and as new technologies of naval battles are being evolved, we have to

focus on making the oceans and seas free from nuclear weapons.

It should be a matter of some concern for all of us that the intermediate and short-range nuclear missiles now planned to be eliminated, including cruise missiles, are the ones that a space-based ABM defense system cannot cope with because of their shorter acceleration path or low altitude. It could very well be the strategy of those who depend more on space-based ABM to eliminate those nuclear weapons it cannot easily cope with. And the partial reduction of nuclear weapons may be only a step towards perfecting a pre-emptive first attack strategy. The elimination of these weapons increases the "security" of the one who can pull the trigger first. The refusal of the USA to discontinue SDI research is an indication that a winnable nuclear war fighting strategy is not yet abandoned. And since there is no nuclear freeze, new and more deadly weapons continue to be added to the stockpiles. Most of the work for peace will still be ahead of us after the Summit.

In this connection I need to say a word about the recent UN International Conference on the Relation between Development and Disarmament, held at the UN headquarters in New York from August 24th to September 11th, in accordance with a UN General Assembly resolution (39/151-C) of December 17th, 1984. The proposal originally came from President François Mitterand of France. His idea seems to have been based on proposals before the UN since at least 1987 to create an International Disarmament Fund for Development. The General Assembly has adopted several resolutions (in 1980, 81, 82, 83 and 84) appealing to all states to reduce military budgets and reallocate resources to development. President Mitterand had envisioned a future in which resources saved by disarmament would be channelled into development, particularly development in the developing countries. There must have been the hope that, once such a fund was set up, the developing countries would become more interested in disarmament, since they would stand to benefit from it directly. The UN Conference this year did not adopt a resolution to create the International Disarmament Fund for Development. What it did, however, has turned out to be even more significant. The consensus document produced by the 150 nations participating in the Conference has been called a landmark. The USA did not participate, on the plea that disarmament and development are two independent processes and should not be considered together in a conference - a point of view the 150 nations unanimously repudiated. The document becomes a landmark for the following reasons:

a) It not only officially and politically recognized the inseparable relation between disarmament and development. It pointed out that global military expenditures were a major cause of distorted and unjust global development; that we have to choose between continuing the arms race and the growing militarization on the one hand, and a more equitable global development on the other.

b) It recognized officially the "non-military threats to security" - in hunger and poverty, ill-health and illiteracy. It thus enlarged the concept of security to involve North-South relations which are always a factor in East-West relations.

So long as some people remained victims of oppression, exploitation and injustice, there could be no final peace or security. Economic security for all is an essential part of global common security.

c) It recognized the triangular relationship between Disarmament, Development and Common Security. We have seen more clearly that among nations is an essential aspect of just and equitable development in the world. International Security must not be dependent on the force of arms or on the threat to use force. Common Security, Development and Disarmament are thus integrally related to each other. Long-term equitable global development, as well as general and complete disarmament are both dependent on devising and setting up a system of international, global, common security.

II. The Global Economic Crisis

October 19th, 1987, marks the beginning of the end of the military-industrial complex. On that day, now called Black Monday, the value of stocks in the Market Economy world crashed dramatically. In one day, shareholders worldwide lost 500 billion dollars - about the amount of the total of two-third world debt. The Dow Jones index climbed down 508 points in one day - something unprecedented in Market Economy history.

Even the last Great Depression did not see such a dramatic fall. In the three years from September 1st, 1929 to July 1st, 1932, the value of shares in the New York Stock Exchange fell by 74 billion dollars only - from a total of \$90 billion to \$16 billion. Granting that the purchasing power of the dollar was many times higher and the volume of stocks much smaller in the 20s, the crash then was less abrupt. The loss of Market Economy Wealth worldwide in the month of October 1987 alone is estimated at 2 trillion dollars - about the equivalent of the national debt of the largest debtor nation in the world today, the USA.

Mr. Donald R. Regan, formerly Treasury Secretary and Chief of Staff of President Ronald Reagan, in a Washington Post article (25th October 1987) entitled "No More Business as Usual", warned that the so-called "economic recovery" of the last 5 years is now in jeopardy. In this article Mr. Regan does not acknowledge his own share of responsibility in initiating the policies that led to the present crash. But Mr. Regan recognized seven factors that have led to the recent stock market crash:

- a) Deficit budgeting in USA
- b) Unfavorable Trade Balance for the USA
- c) Proposed trade tax bill that would adversely affect US traders
- d) Non-Productive expenditures like excessive military spending
- e) The Federal Government's fiscal policy of tight money and high interest rates
- f) Unreliability and instability of dollar as international and national currency
- g) Talks about increasing budget deficit, rather than reducing it.

It is clear now that Reaganomics, which artificially and temporarily boosted the markets through heavy military expenditure and by greater export of arms to other countries, was a colossal failure in solving the problems of capitalism. In fact it has turned out to be a disaster.

What has happened to the global economy during the 70s, when we were close to an East-West détente, can now lead us to global catastrophe, unless we take some resolute actions.

There was a measure of military-strategic parity between the USA and the USSR in the early 70s. It was at that time that both the Treaty on the Limitation of ABM systems (May 26, 1972) and the SALT-I agreement were signed (1972). The Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe could have led to remarkable progress in détente, if all the three baskets of the Helsinki Agreement could have been implemented.

The vested interests of the market economy world were frightened by the possibility of a real détente, a freeze in nuclear weapons, and a reduction of arms manufacture and trade. The market economy world had by that time invested a great deal of money in arms production. Especially Western economies were heavily militarized, giving comparatively less attention to civilian production and to research on genuine human needs like health, education, culture, shelter, pollution control, and ecobalance. Something similar was happening also in the Soviet Union, where the pressures on military spending and research acted as a constraint on raising the standards of civilian consumption and existence. If the détente had actually progressed, the people of the Soviet Union stood to gain directly. Since all military and civilian production in that country are centrally planned and centrally implemented, it would have been comparatively easier for the military sector of the Soviet economy to be converted to civilian use.

In the market economy world on the other hand, the bulk of military-related production was in private hands, though military production had created a large public sector in capitalist countries (one of the many contradictions of capitalism). The other contradiction was the growing conflict between US and West-European capitalist interests. The US share of world capitalist output stood at 55.8% in 1948. It dwindled to 40.4% by 1970. Meanwhile Western Europe's share rose to 34.3%, coming close to the US share by 1970. Today Europe (East+West) accounts for 55% of world industrial output, according to 1985 figures. Much of this was military production, and a large share of it in private hands. An East-West détente was perceived to be inimical to the interests of the market economy industrial barons, and they developed a strategy, in cooperation with the military structures, to undermine the détente. NATO deployment of Pershing-II missiles and ground-based cruise missiles was a major step in this strategy of undermining the détente.

What changed the whole picture was the influx of petro-dollars into the Western economy. The Arab strategy to use an increase in oil prices as a pressure tactic on the West to force it to

settle the Middle East problem actually back-fired. While increased oil prices created considerable strain on the Western industrial system, it was more than compensated by Arab beneficiaries of the price increase being naively willing to plough back most of the money into the Western economy, through investments, through purchase of expensive weapons, and through an inordinate rise in Arab tourism in the West.

This actually played into the hands of the military-industrial complex. On the one hand the West had more money to invest in arms production, and the market was readily provided by a few Arab nations. Liquid cash was still bulging the pockets of Western banks, and they persuaded other Two-Third world nations to take easy loans and to spend it on buying military and civilian goods from the Western industrial-military system. Two-Third world debt thus arose from \$90 billion in 1971 to \$274 billion by 1977. By the 80s about \$100 billion was being paid out every year by the poor nations to the rich nations by way of debt service including interest.

The petrodollars did a double damage to the developing countries:

- a) it led to accelerated militarization of the Third World and artificially boosting the market economy; and
- b) it dragged many countries into a Shylockian deadlock where the debt burden became a new way of sucking the poor countries' wealth into the rich countries of the market economy world.

Another factor which helped the capitalist economy to go on for some time were regional wars in the Two-Third world, principally the Iraq-Iran war, the Middle East conflict, the military equipping of Pakistan and the Afghan Mujahiddeen, the Central American conflicts, the Malvinas war between Britain and Argentina, and the Southern Africa conflicts. The Iraq-Iran war alone to which more than 35 nations seem to have contributed or sold weapons, cost 500 billion dollars, most of which went to boost military production and military trade in the market economy world.

But all these temporary and artificial means of bolstering up capitalism have now been demonstrated to be ineffective in rescuing capitalism from collapse.

We can say that while the October 19th crash does not immediately lead to a worldwide depression, it must at least lead to the insight that the military expenditures, which are non-productive, cannot indefinitely bolster up the market economy world. The market economy world will have to think in terms of better solutions than military manufactures and military trade to increase its stability and its capacity to sustain itself. It also has another consequence which we are still reluctant to recognize: namely, that military solutions to world problems cannot be final. Let me cite to you some statements made, first from the US News and World Report. In 1950, this journal said: "Business will not go to pot so long as war is a threat." That is, business depends on the threat of war

1
remaining in the world. "So long as every alarm can step up spending, lending for defence at home and aid abroad, so long as that can happen, our economy is safe". So long as new wars can be created, the economy is safe. That's what the journal said 37 years ago. It's a fantastic way of thinking to assume that the Cold War was the best way to bolster up the economy. That was not simply the US News and World Report which said that. A very liberal friend of mine, Jerome Wiesner, the President of MIT, made a similar statement. He is not a rightist; he was scientific advisor to Kennedy and Johnson; "the armaments industry has provided a sort of automatic stabilizer for the whole economy, for the American economy." A more left-oriented man, Herbert Gintis wrote in the Review of Radical Political Economics: "The military industrial complex has eliminated the spectre of secular stagnation". Stagnation in the market economy was avoided by the military industrial complex. This was stated even by a leftist. We are now moving beyond that stage. We are coming to a new stage where we can no longer prop up the economy by military expenditures. That is the lesson which comes from Oct. 19 crash, I would say that crash is one of the healthiest things that has happened to us recently.

III. The Developments in Global Science/Technology

On the third issue I must say two things very briefly. I could say many more things about new developments in world science and technology. Here I can only illustrate, by mentioning two new developments, leaving aside others like information technology, technology as a commodity, new super-computer technology and so on.

One of the most frightening developments in global science/technology is the division of the scientific community into two parts. In the world scientific community, researchers and technologists are now engaged in serving the military industrial complex. They are in the service of defence production and the scientific development of defence production is becoming more and more of a secret business. And these scientists are sworn to a kind of secrecy. They are not supposed to share their scientific knowledge with their scientific colleagues. This is something new in science. Science was always regarded as public knowledge, which can be shared, discussed, disputed, experimented, tried wherever necessary, this is no longer the case. Military knowledge is becoming more and more a secret property and in the scientific community there is a new polarization. A large number of scientists are now turning towards opposition to nuclear and other military developments in science and technology. A large number of scientists are saying that we must liberate science and technology from its captivity to the military-industrial complex and re-deploy it to solve the problems of humanity as a whole. That number of scientists - thank God - is increasing constantly. At the same time, a large number of scientists are being clubbed together into a scientific secret pact. They do not want to look at the moral issues at all. They are concerned only about the higher salaries and better facilities, for their research work which the ordinary

academy or university cannot provide but which the military industry provides. This polarization is one major development in the global scientific community which we have to watch. I would also like to say that within that military-scientific community there are two foci: one is that of directed energy weapons, that is, laser beams, particle beams and other directed energy weapons with complex electronic guidance systems. This is the new secret knowledge that they are building up. And we have to worry about this development of new weapons while nuclear weapons are becoming obsolete, new weapons are being created. We should demand that science and technology be accountable to the public about what they are doing and not pledged to this kind of immoral secrecy. They must be accountable to the total scientific community but also to the common public. That is the demand that the peace movements have to make.

There is another development that I am not even competent to discuss adequately. I will just mention it, that is the developments in super-conductivity. This is a major breakthrough which has happened this year. We have been researching to find a conducting medium without any resistance at normal temperature. All the previously known conducting mediums which have no resistance can be so only at extremely low temperatures, which are very expensive to maintain. We have the possibility now of getting ceramics, synthetic ceramics, which can conduct electricity without any loss, without creating heat or resistance in the conducting medium. This can have many positive consequences, but it can also have one negative consequence. That is fusion technology, which has been at a standstill for some time, making a few occasional jumps. Fusion of atoms is dependent on a medium which can contain the very high heat produced by fusion without itself melting. And they have been trying to build a plasma case which will contain the excessive heat produced by fusion. Now superconductivity produces the possibility that there may be solid containers, for this high fusion temperature. We are not there yet, but the breakthrough made this year in superconductivity can lead to the possibility of solid containers for high temperatures produced by fusion. This can be exceedingly problematic for us. It has some positive effects - it makes the magnetic cushion effect easier and more economic - you know these hovercraft which just sail on a magnetic cushion - there would not be any heat produced by that process so that it would be made a little easier. It can also make it possible to develop huge multikilometre long particle accelerators. You know that the accelerator in Geneva at CERN is many kilometres long and already it is underground, the huge particle accelerator. Now with the new fusion technology, with the new superconductivity technology, we are in a position to create huge particle accelerators with which we might make more experiments and research about thermonuclear fusion, and there is a big danger in that. It also can help in space travel, because loss-free energy accumulators can now be created. This means that space travel may be made easier by this new discovery.

Well, what I am saying is that there are new discoveries, and like all discoveries in science they are capable of positive and negative results, but we as the public have a responsibility to watch these things. That is the first thing I wanted to say.

IV. New Thinking

Now, finally, I come to the point which is the easiest, probably, to do and about which most of you already know more than I do. I will still try to look at this new thinking and the concept of socialist reconstruction. I don't want to describe perestroika and glasnost, technically, I have been trying, however, to look at the literature arising on the subject in various parts of the socialist world. I see the following six or seven points in this new thinking. The most important first point apart from the radically humanist moral framework, is the expansion of democracy and selfmanagement. That is the major primary element that is being stressed in the practical aspect of this new thinking. It is actually an old idea in Marxism, but it had been suppressed in favor of a heavily centralized economy and administration. This has been the norm within socialism for some time, which is a violation of an original affirmation of Marx. Now they are coming back to this intrinsic principle of Marxism in order to create local self-government, local responsibility within the economic production units, and a certain amount of pluralism within the economic and political structure. That's the first idea, self-administration; it almost reminds one of the French idea of the late 60s of "autogestion", which is also a Marxist idea which the French leftists picked up in the 60s, but now it is being dusted and brought back by official Socialism itself. It is a very interesting development which has many possibilities for the future development of socialism.

Secondly, the idea that the assets of the economic unit belong to the people has so far been only in the text-books. It has not always been realized. The people even in the socialist countries have never felt that "this factory belongs to us". A new law has been passed by the Soviet parliament in June 87 which says that the assets of an economic unit belong to its personnel or workers. That's the new law, that the workers own the factory and I don't know what this really means. There have been a number of surveys made by Pravda to see to what extent this is becoming real. Izvestia had made another survey of the workers in several factories and they discovered that 85% of those polled stated that the workers are not yet in control. That survey has been published within the Soviet Union itself; the Izvestia study shows that even though the law is passed by the Soviet government, its implementation has not proceeded very far. The open publication of this survey by Izvestia is itself a very new development. These facts are now openly available to the public; the public can discuss these questions, that a law passed by the Soviet Union is not yet implemented in the factories; that is already something. They are saying that public property does not mean that it is a no-man's-land, but that the workers are co-

owners, therefore directly responsible for the performance of the local economic unit. To what extent that will become real, I do not know. The third element, which is interesting to me is a new motto which reminds me of the old capitalist motto which said "What is good for General Motors is good for America". There is a new version of that in the socialist countries, which says "what is good for the people is good for socialism". This is a very interesting motto. It means that issues need not be handled on an ideologically dogmatic basis, trying to force a kind of class analysis on every phenomenon; but authorities have to see that what is good for the people in each particular situation is ultimately good for socialism. This is a bold new step, away from the ideological dogmatic sterility, and I think this is a very important attempt to implement Lenin's dictum that "genuine socialism is a system of civilized cooperators", it is not simply a system of centralized control.

Fourth, the role of the market is now recognized but not in an absolute way, as if the market can look after itself. The market goes with central planning and control. Along with central planning and controlling the market can also function, which means the assessment of the market forces is not totally negative anymore. You have to take the reality of market forces and take that into account in your planning and regulating of the economy. Again it is a very interesting assessment of the dialectic between central planning and market forces. It is a bold new step. The new perestroika also wants to emphasize that the social guarantees to the people can never be revoked. Whatever reconstruction you do, the socialist guarantees to the people cannot be revoked. The social guarantees of employment, housing, old-age pension, education, health, etc. cannot be revoked, but they also say that this should not lead to parasitism. Sometimes, the social guarantees are leading to parasitism, people living on the economy without producing anything. That can no longer be accepted.

Fifth, the four points of Lenin are now being reemphasized. Industrialization must go at the highest possible speed, farming must become cooperative. The four main points of Lenin's vision are (a) farming cooperatives, (b) fast industrialization, (c) cultural revolution, i.e. constantly new cultural forces being generated without which the human factor cannot operate effectively, and (d) ethnic harmony. These four principles of Lenin, are being reemphasized in the new revolution, in the new reconstruction. But as I said, these reforms are not yet 100% successful. Izvestia which sells 8 million copies made a sample survey of its readers, and 85% of those who responded to the poll said that formalism and red tape are still evident in the economy. Another survey reveals that only 25% agreed that there is some improvement in the bureaucracy, 75% still think there is no improvement in the bureaucratic weight in the economy. Another survey, more positive, says that 63% of those polled believe that there is more glasnost, more openness in discussion, and in corporate tackling of problems within the economic unit. But still only 33% believe that ordinary workers are taking a larger role in management. These

are interesting figures which are now published for general discussion, and I want to conclude by saying that in this vision which is behind socialist reconstruction now, there are two basic insights. One is the vision of a new world - a new world in which people of different ideologies can live together, and cooperate together without having only adversary relations. This vision has to be regenerated and fostered because it underlies everything. Tomorrow we won't have a world where all nations are socialist. In the world of tomorrow, it is now generally accepted, we will have socialist nations as well as market economy nations. But people with different ideologies and economic systems must learn to live together in that world and not wait until everybody becomes socialist, to have that peaceful world. The peaceful world must come now, and whatever antagonistic and negative images socialism may have had in the past, it must now receive a more humanist image and reality; and that, I think, is the central vision of perestroika.

The second aspect of that vision is one which should make us all rejoice. It is the aspect of glasnost or openness. Openness means that truth must be faced and not covered up. This has again two faces - one that of correctly understanding and recognizing the present in terms of a clear and unambiguous assessment of the past which has led to the present. This means recognizing past mistakes of socialism and making amends. There is no doubt that personality cult, arbitrary authority, and cruelty and deceit in dealing with fellow-human beings were failures of the Stalinist period. These should not only be acknowledged, but also be purged from socialist practice. The second face is open creative discussion of all problems among the people, and also between authorities and peoples, among workers and managers in an economic production unit, amongst nationalities in the Soviet Union, among artists, intellectuals and the people - at all levels. This means that socialism is achieving a new maturity. This glasnost will have to be responsibly exercised by a mature people. If anyone misuses this openness for personal ambition and careerism, such persons will have to be reprimanded and restrained.

Conclusion

I have touched upon four significant trends in the global situation. I have not tried to give a comprehensive picture, but only to point to some. The four trends I have touched upon lead to some clear conclusions.

- (a) Nuclear disarmament, with a comprehensive test ban treaty, a freeze, and total elimination of all nuclear weapons by all nations with a ban on research and development of new weapons remains a first priority.
- (b) The development of Global Common Security through international trust and cooperation, without resort to weapons and with full attention given to economic and cultural insecurity of the majority of the world's people should receive more attention from peace movements.

- (c) The one world which we are to build is inescapably one of cultural, ideological and social plurality; in it science/technology has to be liberated from its present bondage to war and profit; science/technology should not only be responsible to the people, but must be reoriented to serve the genuine interests and cultural creativity of different peoples in their own ways. The religions of the world have to be taken seriously by Socialism, since 80% of the world population have varying degrees of adherence to various religions. The religions on the other hand should abandon their uninformed anti-communism and should both take socialism seriously, and help creatively in the evolving of a new moral order in a pluralistic world acceptable to religionists and secularists.
- (d) The new thinking and new reconstruction in socialist countries should be welcomed by all peace forces, not only because they can lead us to relaxation of tensions, and to peace, but also because it can lead us to the vision of a new world where all of us can live together in freedom and dignity in just and peaceful societies.

* * *